The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1886.

The Week.

THE Missouri-Pacific boycott is now at an end. There may be a short season of brigandage, but that too will come to an end. The boycotters adhere to the opinion that trains cannot run on the Missouri Pacific Railroad without their services, and when they see them running they think that there is something wrong in the moral constitution of the universe. They say that they will "hold out" all summer and all winter if necessary Holding out means that they will subsist firmly on contributions collected in all parts of the country from people as poor as themselves. There is no objection to this, but it is an arrangement which obviously cannot last long. As Mr. Arthur, the chief of the Locomotive Brotherhood, said in the beginning, "Strike means assessment, and assessment means death." The longer the taxes are levied to support the Martin Irons boycotters, the more dissatisfied will taxpayers become. Disintegration will set in at both ends of the line as soon as the burden becomes onerous. The assessments are not equal to full wages, and therefore the men who have families and responsibilities on their hands will hunger for steady employment, and will apply to Mr. Hoxie for it. Some of the Knights have already done so. The residuum will either drift away, or "take to the road," or become a burden on public charity. The man who is entitled to the credit of bringing this great conspiracy to confusion is H. M. Hoxie. What Mrs. Gray has done on a small scale he has done on a large one, in the midst of infinite difficulties and in the presence of personal danger Although not an officer of the law, he has vindicated its majesty to better purpose than any Governor on his line. He has set a notable example to all railroad managers and to his countrymen generally, the moral significance of which is that the way to deal with a boycott is not to yield to it an inch, and not to appear to yield.

The most wholesome and reassuring sign of the times is the formation of Law and Order Leagues in the Southwest to try conclusions with the Knights of Labor. Such a league has been formed at Sedalia, Mo., a perfect hot-bed of the Martin Irons type of knight-errantry. The Sedalia League has sent word to Mr. Hoxie that he need give himself no further pains to insure the protection of life and property there—that they will be responsible for such protection hereafter. Similar leagues are forming in Texas, where they are very much needed. There is room for one at East St. Louis and for another at Kansas City. In short, there are very few places not strictly agricultural where they will not be wanted sooner or later. New York ought to have the largest one in the country, and steps should be taken to form a nucleus now. The time is approaching when civilization must fight for existence. The right of every man to do the best he can for himself and for those dependent on him, subject to laws which all have an equal voice in making, must be defended in this country, and will be. It must be defended, too, by those who believe in it and not by hirelings. It must be defended on the plan adopted at Portland, Oregon, when that city was threatened recently by an anti-Chinese mob, and by the plan which was put in execution a few days earlier at Seattle, Washington Territory. When the lawless elements found themselves face to face with an organization pledged to lay down the lives of its members in defence of the law, they vanished like witches before holy water. The Portland example was the most patriotic uprising we have seen since the firing on Sumter. The Sedalia example, so far as we have any account of it, appears to be akin to it.

We are glad to see that the authorities are at last taking measures to punish one of the worst criminals now at large in the United States—Martin Irons. This man, as the head of the local assembly of the Knights of Labor which has its headquarters in St. Louis, is not only immediately responsible for starting the strike on the Missouri-Pacific and for continuing it after Mr. Powderly ordered it stopped, but he is also to blame for the outrages upon men who were anxious to work which culminated in the fatal collision at Fort Worth, Texas. When the strike was ordered off by Mr. Powderly, and the Knights at Fort Worth telegraphed Irons about it, he telegraphed: "Hold the fort." When the trouble grew and affairs became desperate, he telegraphed: "Hold the fort at all hazards." This was equivalent to an order to resort to any extreme of violence in the attempt to prevent men from taking the places of the strikers, and the shooting of officers of the law which soon followed was in obedient compliance with this order. The Grand Jury at Fort Worth is investigating the affair, and there ought to be no question about the prompt indictment and conviction of this inciter of murder. Martin Irons in the penitentiary would for the first time be rendering a great service to the public.

Mr. Powderly, in his last communication to Jay Gould, has put himself out of the pale of intelligent discussion and into the company of wind-bags and common scolds, where Martin Irons has hitherto held the platform. Mr. Powderly's former communications had entitled him to respectful consideration, because they were based upon principles and had a certain logical sequence. They accordingly enlisted the sympathy of fair-minded men, who thought they perceived in Mr. Powderly a man, holding a position of great responsibility and great difficulty, trying to minimize the consequences of a very serious blunder committed by misguided men belonging to the order of which he is the head. For a few days Mr. Powderly held a unique position before the country, as one who could get a hearing from both sides in a controversy of national import, and could use the language of reason to both. How he has forfeited this strong position the merest glance at his letter to Gould will show. It did not need Gould's crushing reply to expose him as a blatherskite, and an untruthful witness to the facts preceding the present correspondence between them.

As it is impossible to make an analysis of mere rant, it will suffice to state what kind of rant Mr. Powderly deals in. He first tells what kind of arbitration he understood that Gould had agreed to at their meeting in New York. It is noticeable that all the negotiators of the Knights of Labor, from Mr. Powderly down to the smallest boycotters and "sandwich men," have a lot of understandings over and above what is reduced to writing, from which they can argue indefinitely, and that the other side commonly has no defence against these unrecorded agreements. But it happens in this case that Gould has an instrument of writing which proves that Powderly's memory is disgracefully bad. Powderly says:

"I did not hear either you or Mr. Hopkins say that the present trouble out along your road would not be arbitrated with the men who were not at work. It was my firm belief when I left you that night, that you meant to have the entire affair submitted to arbitration at the first possible moment. That belief is shared in by Mr. McDowell, who was present during the entire interview."

Gould replies by quoting a telegram sent by Powderly's secretary during the meeting, or immediately after it, in these words:

"NEW YORK, March 30, 1886.

"*Martin Irons, St. Louis:*

"Have been in conference all day, with the result that Vice-President Hoxie agrees to the following: Willing to meet a committee of our employees, without discrimination, *who are actually at work in the service of the company at the time such committee is appointed*, to adjudicate with them any grievance that they may have. Have your Executive Committee order the men to return to work, and also select a special committee from the employees of the Missouri-Pacific to wait on Mr. Hoxie to adjust any difference. Do this as quickly as possible. Board will leave for St. Louis to-morrow.

"FREDERICK TURNER, Secretary."

The significance of this is, that Powderly was excessively anxious to cover up the blunder of the strikers and get them out of their scrape, realizing that they were exciting against themselves and against the entire order the active hostility of public opinion, and bringing upon themselves the heavy hand of the law. But it was necessary, for appearance' sake and to soothe the pride of the strikers, and to maintain his own influence over them, that he should get something that they could call a concession from Hoxie. This something was Arbitration. Arbitration with whom? "Not with men who are not in our employ," said Hoxie, to whom Gould referred the matter by telegraph, "but we will arbitrate with all who are in our employ, whether Knights or other." To this kind of arbitration Powderly agreed, as the Turner telegram shows.

The remainder of Mr. Powderly's communication is a challenge to Gould to meet him in court, or rather an announcement of his determination to force him into court. No legal issue is mentioned upon which the court is to pass judgment. A vague suggestion is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made that the issue to be tried is that of "the people against monopoly." Rant of this description fills half a column in the newspapers, and ends with a demand that Gould shall "restore every man to *his place* except those who have been engaged in the destruction of property or who have broken the laws." There we have again the central idea of Mr. Powderly's organization, viz.: that every Knight has a right to select his own employer, to fix his own rate of wages, to go on a shindy as often as he likes, and to hold his place for life.

The antics of the *Tribune* in reference to the labor disturbances, its frequent flops and its generally unaccountable behavior, need some explanation. The *Tribune* itself is under a boycott, and has been so for more than a year, and some of the leading mercantile firms in this city have been boycotted for advertising in its columns. There is every reason, both public and private, why the *Tribune* should fight boycotting wherever it shows its ugly mug, and fight hard. But its course has been pusillanimous in a high degree. It has apologized for street riots in New York, and has censured the officers of the law in East St. Louis, and its reports and special telegrams have read as though they had been revised by a Venerable Sage of the Knights of Labor. This, however, is not the fact. They have simply been revised by an editor who thinks that the votes of the Knights can be secured for Mr. Blaine, as a candidate for the Presidency, a couple of years from now, if they are "spoken fair" at this crisis. A most profound delusion. The Knights are not the wisest people in the world, but they know one thing for certain, and that is that the Republican party is not their party. They know also that the *Tribune* is not and never can be friendly to them, and that under all of its bowing and smirking there is a spirit of hostility to their lawless proceedings which differs in no wise from, say, that of the *Evening Post* except in the frankness and frequency of its utterance.

It would be a mistake to consider such an affair as the present strike on the Third Avenue Railroad as a struggle between employer and employed or capital and labor. It is really a struggle to determine whether this city, and for that matter the whole country, shall or shall not be ruled by "walking delegates." The Walking Delegate, who is the executive officer of the trades unions, is generally a man of precisely the same type as the ward politician—that is, he is but a poor workman in any regular calling, but has considerable facility of speech and capacity for organization and "management." The unions have now clothed him with enormous power, which naturally turns his head. To be able to enter great factories at any hour, with the air of a master, bully the proprietor, order the men about, and by a mere sign to suspend the work and put the concern in danger of bankruptcy, and to stop great public lines of communication, is, of course, well calculated, particularly as it brings him a comfortable income, to make drunk with pride and self-conceit a trumpery fellow to whom nobody would pay $3 a day in any regular industry. Moreover, just as the ward politician delights in frequent elections, and the military monarch delights in frequent wars, the Walking Delegate revels in strikes and "tie ups." They give him occupation, exalt his office in the eyes of his dupes, and enable him to display his power on a great scale before the multitude, and get his name into all the papers. Consequently his aim is to magnify all differences, inflame all disputes, and cultivate envy, hatred, and rancor in his union toward all other classes of the community, so as to keep his followers in a striking temper, and leave as little as possible to persuasion, or discussion, or public opinion.

A strike on a street railroad in New York has no chance of success, whatever be the ostensible or the real reasons for it, if the owners of the property and the applicants for the vacant places are protected against violence. It does not require any great skill or any long training to drive a pair of horses or to collect fares on the cars. Experienced men are preferred of course, but as all the present drivers and conductors were once inexperienced, so other raw hands can soon acquire the necessary experience. There are unemployed men in New York, or men in less desirable employments, sufficient to run all the street cars on all the lines. Situations as drivers and conductors are always in demand. Therefore, the success or non success of a strike depends very much but not wholly upon enforcement of the law. Public opinion does and always will require that men in the employ of corporations holding franchises in the nature of monopolies shall be fairly treated. What is fair treatment cannot be defined in all cases, but directors of street railroads and directors of all railroads know very well what they can and what they cannot do. The Third Avenue Company might lawfully dismiss all their employees because they belong to a trade union, but they would not do such a thing because public opinion would not sustain them. The atmosphere in which they live would be unwholesome. The right to join a union without forfeiting one's chance to earn a living is so much a part of the common environment that it needs no other enforcement than that of public opinion. The right of a man to labor for his bread without joining a union is equally sacred, and is, up to this time, as fully supported by bulwarks of public opinion. The demand of the Third Avenue strikers that the company shall discharge all employees who do not belong to the "Empire Protective Association" is so glaring an invasion of private rights that it would have excited universal surprise and abhorrence a few years ago. It excites little surprise now, because it is so common an occurrence, but it excites as much abhorrence as ever.

Justice Duffy, who has been fining Mrs. Gray's boycotters, and at the same time giving them good advice, has besides his courage one excellent qualification for dealing with this class of cases, and that is a strong sense of humor. He sees the absurd or comic side of it. His observation that not the boycotters only, but all of us, himself included, want our wages raised, goes to the root of the matter. There is no desire so prevalent among men of all trades and callings as the desire for more pay. The readiness to strike for it, if striking will produce the desired effect, is very widespread. There is no calling in which striking for a rise of wages is not common except the clerical calling. Doctors, lawyers, teachers, editors, engineers, as well as mechanics and laborers, strike whenever they feel confident that striking will increase their income—that is, they insist on working for those who will pay them best, and for no one else. But they do not follow the man who refuses to give them their price, around the streets, with libelling placards on their backs, or hang around his door trying to frighten away the butcher and grocer, or take the nuts off his wagon, or poison his dog. It is not striking that is shameful, but these savage and silly attacks on property and peace.

No speech has been made in the United States Senate for a long while which reflected more credit upon the man who made it than that delivered by Joseph R. Hawley, of Connecticut, in the recent debate on the Army Bill. Since these labor troubles began, there has been found hardly a single politician in the land who did not truckle to the mob spirit, and the cheapest sort of demagogism was retailed on the floor of the Senate Chamber by such men as Teller, of Colorado, and Van Wyck, of Nebraska. These Senators greedily seized the occasion of General Logan's proposition to increase the army from 25,000 to 30,000 men, as an opportunity for "making themselves solid" with the Knights of Labor and the professional labor agitators, and insinuated that Senators who favored an addition to the army wanted to use the soldiers to "put down the people," and to sustain Jay Gould and his confederates, as the army used to be employed to sustain the slaveholders. General Hawley rose to the occasion, and denounced this introduction of cheap demagogism with the warmth that such contemptible tactics merited. He pointed out that a strong military force in reserve is necessary to the maintenance of civil authority, and, while defending the right of men dissatisfied with their employment to strike, asserted the right and necessity of using the military to put down disorder if the strikers resort to violence, concluding with these manly words:

"There are times when I would be with the laboring man for a strike and I would strike to the end of the contest. I would not work sixteen hours a day for any man, with half an hour for my dinner. I would strike; I would organize; I would work for a better day; but I would not permit the thieves of the city of New York to rush out when I was striking, to destroy the property of the company from which I expected to get my living; and if the Sheriff could not do anything with them, if they were too strong for him and too strong for the police, I would have the Sheriff do what I saw done in New York once myself, call out the old Seventh Regiment and shoot the defiant wrong-doers down if they could not be made to yield in any other way. I would do that for the sake of the laborers themselves, and I would tell the laborers to-day just as I am telling it to you. You cannot deceive them by any other kind of talk. There is no use in the Senators tempting them, and I warn them against the worst enemies they have on the footstool, the men who indulge in the sort of conversation we have had here to-day from the Senator from Nebraska."

The Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette*, a quondam free-trade newspaper, argues, in a long and rather perfunctory article, that instead of repealing the duties on wool,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congress ought to restore the tariff of 1867. "The manufacturers," it says, "who selfishly oppose the policy that has so enormously increased the home production of wool are short-sighted." On the other hand, the manufacturers contend that the wool-growers who favor the policy that has so enormously increased the importation of woollen cloth, and correspondingly depressed the production of the same in the United States, are themselves short-sighted. The truth appears to be that there has been so great a decline in the price of foreign wool in recent years that English manufacturers, who get it duty free, while American manufacturers are taxed as high as 113 per cent. on some varieties, are sending wool to this country in the form of cloth and ready-made clothing to an unprecedented extent. Thus the demand for American wool is falling off in the face of a rapidly increasing demand for woollen goods, and the price of wool is consequently not remunerative to growers in this country, except in the Western Territories and on the Pacific Coast, where land is very cheap. The complaint of the Ohio wool-growers is, that they cannot produce wool at a profit on land worth $50 to $100 per acre, as against wool produced in Texas, Montana, California, South Africa, and other parts of the world where land is worth next to nothing, and where the cost of production is merely that of herding sheep. Instead of using their land for more remunerative purposes—as they will be obliged to do soon, tariff or no tariff—they rush to Congress and ask that the duties be raised. They do not see that it is the importation of cloth and not the importation of wool that ails them.

The ultimate destination of wool is to be spun and woven. Any policy which induces the American consumer to buy a foreign-made coat prevents the selling of as much American wool as would go to the production of a coat. This is something that the Ohio wool-growers will not see. They are slowly strangling their only customers, the American manufacturers. The latter are not entitled to much sympathy from the free-traders' point of view, since they have assented to the wool tariff in order to secure protection for themselves. But the condition of both industries is deplorable if it be true, as Mr. Charles A. Beech, a veteran manufacturer, of Connecticut, says, that "the woollen factories of the United States would not sell for 25 per cent. of their original cost," and, as the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette* says, that wool-growing in Ohio does not now yield any profit. We see no chance of any improvement in either branch of industry until both are well-nigh extinguished. The profits of woollen manufacturing in the United States are not equal to the depreciation of the machinery in use. The manufacturers see ruin impending, yet they are deterred by an ancient superstition from demanding from Congress the only thing that can possibly save them, viz.: free wool. The wool-growers, if the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette* speaks truly, are almost as badly off. We are rapidly nearing the condition so ardently desired by John Randolph, who said that he so loathed manufactures that he would walk a mile to kick a sheep.

Since the prohibitory amendment to the Constitution was adopted in Rhode Island a fortnight ago, the curious fact has been brought out that there is a prohibitory law on the statute book and has been ever since 1852, as well as another law, passed later, known as the nuisance act, for the purpose of reënforcing and strengthening the stringent provisions of the original prohibitory law. Since these laws were enacted, another law has been passed which allowed municipalities to license the sale of liquors by a majority vote, and under this latter law a few cities and towns have voted to grant licenses, the effect of which was to suspend the operation of the prohibitory law in those places for the time being in respect to the dealers who thus obtained licenses. The only effect of the constitutional amendment, therefore, is to render the license law null and void, prevent the Legislature from enacting another, and give the old prohibitory statutes unlimited sway. But the few cities and towns which have been voting in favor of license include a large majority of the people of the State, and their votes year after year in favor of license show that public sentiment among a large majority of the people will not sustain prohibition. The fact that barely three-fifths, not of all the people of Rhode Island, but of those who enjoy the right under a property qualification to vote, and who took the trouble to vote a fortnight ago, declared in a pet for prohibition, does not change the public sentiment of the people in the cities and large towns—and a form of words amounts to nothing when public sentiment does not infuse life into them.

We are shocked to learn from the *Herald* that there is, after all, some doubt whether President Cleveland is engaged to be married to a Buffalo lady now travelling in Europe. After all the excitement stirred up last week on this subject, the President clearly owes it to the newspapers to get himself engaged. He need not necessarily be engaged to the Buffalo lady whose biography has been published and whose photograph has been printed, but he is bound to do something to satisfy the press. Secretary Lamar, too, is under obligations to the reporters. His banns were published last week simultaneously with Mr. Cleveland's, and now comes a report from Macon, Ga., where the lady resides, that there is no such engagement. This is an attack upon the liberty of the press. It is calculated also to wound the finer feelings of human nature. What can be more harrowing to the feelings of a modest woman than to have her wedding indefinitely postponed through the fault of a bridegroom elected for her by universal suffrage? Surely these are cases for arbitration. We commend them to the Congressional committee on that subject.

The last session of the present Mexican Congress was opened by President Diaz on April 1. The President's message takes occasion to assert, pending a thorough investigation which has been ordered, that the late conflict between American and Mexican troops was due entirely to a mistake on the part of the latter. The only other point of interest referred to in the department of foreign affairs is the fact that the Mexican Minister to the United States has been instructed to negotiate with the Chinese Minister resident in Washington a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the Mexican Republic and the Celestial Empire. General Diaz enumerates a great number of minor reforms and improvements which have been undertaken by his administration, dwelling chiefly, however, on the efforts that have been made to solve the financial problems which confront the nation. He reports a slight advance in the revenues of the Government. According to him, the creditors of the republic have cheerfully acquiesced in the funding laws of last June, and are exchanging their old bonds for the new ones of the "Consolidated Debt." He thinks that if the interest can be met promptly for a year or two, the credit of the nation will be in large measure restored.

Mr. Gladstone has introduced the Irish Land Bill, which is to form a sort of rider to the Home-Rule Bill. Its main feature is that landlords wishing to sell out are to be permitted to sell to the State, at a price equal as a rule to twenty years of the present rentals, and to receive payment in a 3 per cent. Government bond. The Government is then to sell or rent to the tenants as the case may be, and the rent or interest will be a first charge on the Irish revenues, and will of course be collected by the Irish Government. The position of this bill is very peculiar. The Irish care nothing about it, because it is avowedly a bill for the relief of the landlords. The English Radicals, too, care little about it, except as a help to Mr. Gladstone in carrying through his home-rule scheme. Many of them object to it strongly, as increasing the national debt, and possibly increasing taxation in England, for the benefit of an undeserving class. To both these objections Mr. Gladstone replies, as we replied the other day to our correspondent Mr. Linton, that the landlords were the English garrison in Ireland; that England either backed up or overlooked their misdeeds, and for long years deliberately refused to consider the Irish complaints against them, and is therefore morally responsible for their existence and the security of their property. In fact, the strongest support of the bill must come from the Tories, who are already hoarse with denunciations of the companion measure—the Home-Rule Bill.

The debate was chiefly remarkable for Mr. Chamberlain's unmistakable display of the white flag. He has plainly discovered that Mr. Gladstone is stronger with the country than he thought he was, and that the defections have not greatly damaged the Ministry. So he gives out that he is not so very much opposed to Mr. Gladstone after all, and hopes some day to act with him again. The malicious say that Mr. Chamberlain has been helped into this attitude by poor Lord Hartington's having killed himself as a party leader through going over neck and crop to the Tories, and figuring on the same platform with Lord Salisbury as a critic of Mr. Gladstone. Having thus successfully disposed of his chief rival, the Birmingham statesman is, they say, quite ready to consider the Premier's plans indulgently, and come back to him by and by.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, April 14, to TUESDAY, April 20, 1886, inclusive.]

DOMESTIC.

IN the House of Representatives on Wednesday, by a vote of 106 Democrats against 168, of whom 49 were Democrats, the proposition to seat Mr. Hurd (Dem., Ohio) in place of Romeis (Rep.), the sitting member, was rejected.

The House Committee on Ways and Means on Thursday decided by a vote of 9 to 1 to report favorably the resolution recommending the abrogation of the Hawaiian treaty.

The report of the Committee on the Electoral Count upon the Hoar bill was presented to the House on Thursday. In that part of section 4 which prohibits the rejection of the vote of any State from which only one return has been received "except by the affirmative vote of both houses," the Committee has struck out the exception. A material amendment has been made in the latter part of the same section relating to two sets of returns from one State, so as to provide that those votes only shall be counted which are cast by electors whose appointment shall have been duly certified under the seal of the State and the executive thereof, in accordance with the laws of the State, unless the two houses, acting separately, shall concurrently decide such votes not to be the lawful votes of the legally appointed electors.

In the House Labor Committee on Friday a motion to report the Blair bill favorably was made by Mr. James, of New York, and was defeated by a vote of 4 yeas to 6 nays. Mr. James then moved to report the bill without any recommendation. This was also defeated. An adjournment was forced, pending a somewhat complicated parliamentary wrangle. The result of the action and non-action seems to indicate clearly that the bill will not be reported favorably, and that it may be reported either without recommendation or with a substitute. The House Committee on Education also considered on Friday the Blair bill on the same subject, which had been postponed before. The Committee at first voted to postpone it indefinitely, and did so by a vote very hostile to the bill. It was suggested, however, that such action was not courteous to the minority, whereupon it was reconsidered, and the Committee proceeded to consider the bill, section by section. The Committee had not concluded the consideration of the first section at the time of adjournment.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs on Tuesday adopted the bill of Mr. Belmont (Dem., N. Y.) for indemnity to the Chinese for about $147,000 on account of the Rock Springs outrage.

Mr. Logan addressed the Senate on Thursday, vigorously advocating open executive sessions.

The Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate reported favorably on Friday a bill making the depositing of dirt, sand, or other like matter in the tidal waters of New York harbor a misdemeanor, punishable by fine, imprisonment, and, in the case of masters or engineers of vessels, by the revocation or suspension of their licenses. It also provides for the appointment by the President of a Board of Harbor Commissioners, to consist of three officers of the army and two civilians, one of the latter to be nominated by the Chamber of Commerce of New York and the other by the Governor of New Jersey. It appropriates $30,000 to carry out its provisions.

Governor Bate, of Tennessee, has just appointed Washington Curran Whitthorne to succeed Howell E. Jackson as United States Senator. Mr. Whitthorne was born in Tennessee in 1825, was educated at the Knoxville University, and became a lawyer. During the rebellion he held the position of Adjutant-General for Tennessee for four years. Congress removed his political disabilities in 1870, and in the following autumn he was elected a Representative. During the twelve years of his service in Congress he made himself conspicuous as a critic of the naval administration of the Government.

Attorney-General Garland testified before the Telephone Investigating Committee on Monday. He said that he had no consultation with any person connected with the Interior Department as to the hearing in the telephone case, and that he never talked with Solicitor-General Goode on that subject, except as to the amount of fees that should be paid to the Government's special counsel. He had never used his official position to promote the interests of the Pan-Electric Company. "In fact," said Mr. Garland, "as a private citizen I could have done much better for the company, and would have done so." His official position, as having any bearing upon the interest of the Pan-Electric, was never discussed between him and his associates. He prepared the original articles of incorporation, which were adopted with a view to incorporation in New Jersey or Tennessee. He thinks that Tennessee was chosen because there was no requirement as to the paying in of certain percentages.

The Secretary of the Treasury on Tuesday issued a call for $10,000,000 3 per cent. bonds. The call will mature June 1.

The President has settled the long quarrel over the Louisville, Ky., Post-office by the reappointment of Mrs. Virginia Thompson, who has been Postmaster there under three Republican administrations. This appointment was opposed by some of the leading Democratic politicians of the State. A Democratic indignation meeting was held in Louisville, on Saturday night to protest against the reappointment. Representative A. S. Willis was vigorously denounced in the resolutions, which said: "We regret that the President of the United States felt called on to yield his own convictions to the demands of a Congressman who misrepresents his constituents, and puts personal considerations above his duty to his party." A meeting in favor of Mrs. Thompson was held on Monday. All parties were represented, but it was not enthusiastic.

The New York Assembly on Friday passed the Broadway Arcade Railroad Bill by 108 to 8.

Governor Hill, of New York, has vetoed the bill raising the salaries of police captains from $2,000 to $2,750, because it is a question which should be settled by local authorities and not by the State.

Governor Hill has vetoed the Capitol Appropriation Bill, objecting to the removal of Commissioner Perry and the substitution of an ex-officio board

The Committee of the Ohio House appointed to investigate the charges of bribery in connection with the election of Henry B. Payne as United States Senator have submitted their report. It makes no direct charge of bribery, but says the election was surrounded with suspicious circumstances.

As a result of a personal inspection relative to the recent allegations of the Philadelphia *Record* charging gross mismanagement in the soldiers' orphans' schools in Pennsylvania, and the abuse and neglect of the scholars, Governor Pattison on Thursday demanded the resignation of the Rev. R. E. Higbee as State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and summarily removed the Rev. J. W. Sayres, male inspector of soldiers' orphans' schools, and Mrs. E. E. Hutter, female assistant inspector.

A militiaman on guard at the Vandalia yards in East St. Louis on Thursday was fired upon by a striker. He returned the fire, but the man escaped.

There were three acts of violence by strikers in East St. Louis on Thursday night. Two Ohio and Mississippi Railroad switchmen were attacked by a crowd and badly beaten. When they escaped and ran for their lives they were fired upon. An hour later a deputy sheriff met the same gang. Several shots were instantly fired at the deputy. None of them hit him. Later still the pickets of Company B, who are guarding the Louisville and Nashville Depot, were fired on from a vacant house.

The Bridge and Tunnel and the Belt Line Companies of St. Louis have at last employed a sufficient number of men to man all their engines and switches, and they now announce their readiness to do all the transferring across the river and between the various railroad yards in East St. Louis which may be required. This removes the last impediment to free railway traffic at St. Louis.

The strike of switchmen in the Lake Shore yards at Chicago has prevented the handling of freight by that road. On Tuesday an attempt was made to run a train, but it was prevented by the strikers, who knocked a brakeman senseless.

The Elmira division of the Order of Railway Conductors, numbering 160 members, on Sunday, adopted a resolution declaring that "believing arbitration to be the only and proper method to pursue in matters of grievances, we condemn strikes, and assert, further, that they are invariably ill-advised, gotten up by agitators, socialists, incendiaries, and demagogues, rather than by the representatives of honest labor."

A letter from T. V. Powderly, Grand Master Workman of the Knights of Labor, was delivered to Jay Gould on Wednesday. In this letter Mr. Powderly gave a summary of his recollection of two discussions that took place between the Executive Board of the Knights of Labor and Mr. Gould, on March 28 and 30. He denied some of the statements that the latter had made respecting what was said by both sides, and explained what he said respecting the character of the strikers. Mr. Gould was urged to settle the strike at once, and told, if he would do so, he was at liberty to deal with the employees as citizens, not as Knights of Labor. Mr. Powderly challenged Mr. Gould to begin suits for damages against the Knights of Labor. In reply Mr. Gould sent a letter in which he quoted previous correspondence to show the reasons for his acts in reference to the strike, and then censured the threatening tone of Mr. Powderly's communication. Mr. Gould declared that the contest of the Knights of Labor was now not with himself, but with the laws of the land.

Four of the men engaged in distributing boycotting circulars against Mrs. Gray's bakery, in this city were arrested on Wednesday, and on Thursday were fined a dollar each for disturbing the peace.

All the lines of the Third Avenue Railway Company, in this city, ceased running cars on Friday, owing to the strike of 800 employees. On Monday the Executive Board of the Empire Protective Association ordered a tie-up of all street-car lines in the city, except those on Eighth and Ninth Avenues. The order was obeyed. This was done to force a compromise on the Third Avenue officials.

Late on Monday afternoon the Third Avenue Line attempted to run a car. It was assailed by the strikers, and the driver and conductor badly beaten. The police used their clubs vigorously and soon settled the trouble. They made a number of arrests. Early Tuesday morning the Empire Association ordered the general "tie-up" off, on the ground that there was no proof that the other companies were aiding the Third Avenue. If any outside assistance by other companies is extended, the "tie-up" is to be ordered again.

Tornadoes in Minnesota, Iowa, and Dakota on Wednesday did great damage to property,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

besides destroying about fifty lives and seriously injuring 200 people.

By the breaking of a reservoir dam near East Lee, Mass., on Tuesday, the town was terribly devastated and seven people drowned.

Mr. John Bigelow has sent to the Chamber of Commerce an elaborate report of his observations during his visit to the Panama Canal, in which he enumerates the tremendous financial, executive, sanitary, and other difficulties attending the work. He says: "To determine when this canal will be finished, one must know, first, how much work is yet to be done, and, second, how much money the company will be able and disposed to spend annually upon it, and, third, how many laborers or their equivalent in machines it can command. That information has not yet been revealed to man. No one living can even now give anything more than a guess as to the amount of work to be done. All these uncertain elements are rendered more uncertain by the financial situation of the company. It is about entering the market for a new loan of 600,000,000 francs. The price it will have to pay for this money is uncertain, and the price of a future loan, if one should become necessary, is still more uncertain. Till the money is secured, and the cost of getting it ascertained, it would be about as safe to predict the quarter in which the winds will be setting next Christmas Day at St. Petersburg as the time when the canal will be finished or what it will cost. That the canal will now be prosecuted to its completion without any very serious interruption is fairly to be presumed, for too large a proportion of its cost has already been incurred to make a retreat as good policy as an advance. Even if abandoned by the company, the contractors themselves would probably find it for their interest to combine and finish it."

Messrs. Cornelius, William K., Frederick W., and George W. Vanderbilt have given jointly the sum of $250,000 to the College of Physicians and Surgeons, in this city, for the erection and endowment of a building 75 feet by 100 feet, at Tenth Avenue and Sixtieth Street, to be known as the Vanderbilt Clinic. The institution will supplement the work of the Sloane Maternity Hospital and of the College.

John H. Noyes, founder of the Oneida Community, is dead at the age of seventy-five. He was born in Vermont, and in 1834 began to preach "perfectionism." In 1846 he founded the Putney Community, and two years later removed it to Oneida County, N. Y. The system of complex marriages which he preached was abandoned by the community in 1879, and he himself retired into a sort of exile in Canada.

Squire White, aged eighty-eight years, known as a leader of the Rhode Island Dorr war, and famous in his day as a lawyer, died on Thursday at Quinebaug, Conn.

FOREIGN.

Mr. Gladstone propounded his Irish Land Bill to the House of Commons on Friday evening. In substance his statement was as follows: The Land Act was intended to go into effect on the same day on which the Home-Rule Bill would become operative. It would not go on without the operation of the other, which would provide a legislature in Ireland to appoint statutory authority to deal with the landed estates and act between vendor and purchaser. The purchases would be made through the issue of £180,000,000 of 3 per cent. stock issued at par. These new Irish consols might, with the consent of the Treasury, be commuted for stock of a lower denomination. If the stock could not be issued forthwith, scrip of equal value would be issued for the same purpose. The act was to give the landlords the option to sell out under its terms. Its enactments were confined to agricultural holdings, and did not include mansions having demesnes and woods. The state authorities acting between the peasant and land-owner would purchase the land from the land-owner and put the peasant in possession as absolute proprietor, subject to an annual rent charge until the total payments equalled the purchase money. The state would not force the small occupiers to become proprietors. In districts where the population was congested, the state would have the power to decide whether expropriation of the too crowded land should be compulsory. Nobody except the immediate landlords would have the option to sell to the encumbrancer, and then he must sell by foreclosure, and not at an option for himself. Applications to sell would have to be made by all the tenants on an estate, and all these applications and sales would be registered. Applicants would be required to give security for costs in certain cases. The Land Commission would be empowered to refuse applications. The basis of prices would depend upon the rental for a fixed period. The judicial rental of 1845 would be the standard in all cases wherein the rent of the land to be sold was then fixed; in all other cases the Land Commission would have the power to arrive at a price by comparing the other judicial rentals with Griffith's valuation. The Land Commission would also be allowed to examine the state of the books concerning estates for ten years back. Twenty years' rental would be a normal purchase; in exceptional cases twenty-two years' rental would make a purchase. Applications for sale would not be received after March 31, 1890. Ten million pounds of the stock would be issued during 1887, £20,000,000 in 1888, and £20,000,000 in 1889.

Mr. Chamberlain made a speech, in which he said that the land proposals, although they had been modified since he had left the Cabinet, would still impose a great burden on Great Britain without sufficient security for the loans advanced. The bill was calculated not so much to benefit the tenants as a sop for the landlords. Although only £50,000,000 was to be issued, the option to sell was offered to landholders holding land valued at £150,000,000. Supposing that the full number of options to sell should be accepted, how would all the money be provided? He opposed the bill on principle, because it specially protected the landlords. His speech contained the significant statement that he was not an irreconcilable opponent of Mr. Gladstone's policy. If the land proposals should be sufficiently modified, he would be happy to be relieved of the duty of continuing his present attitude of opposition. Permission was given to introduce the bill, and the second reading was fixed for May 13.

A full meeting of opponents of Mr. Gladstone's policy was held at the City Hall, Glasgow, on Wednesday evening. Dr Hanna, leader of the Presbyterians of Belfast, said that he wanted Mr. Gladstone's measure rejected with contempt and scorn. It was the most unworkable, grotesque, and mischievous proposal that had ever emanated from the brain of a statesman, sane or insane. It would hand the peasantry over to the most illiterate priesthood in Christendom.

A mass-meeting of 3,000 opponents of the home-rule scheme was held in London on Wednesday night. Speeches were made by Lord Hartington, Lord Salisbury, and Mr. Goschen. Mr. Gladstone's name was treated with great disrespect, and during his speech, Lord Hartington with great deliberation said: "I hope I may appeal to you not to make the task which I have before me more difficult than it is, by indulging in any manifestations of disrespect to one whom I shall always admire and revere as the leader of a great party; who, in my opinion (I do not expect you all to agree with me), has conferred great advantages on the country; who, at this moment, in my judgment, although I am bound to differ from him, is actuated by feelings as noble and as honest as any that have ever inspired the conduct of an English statesman."

Monday being "Primrose Day" (the anniversary of the death of Lord Beaconsfield), the Conservatives everywhere appeared decorated with his favorite flower. The political crisis was used to emphasize the observance of the fifth anniversary of the Tory leader's demise.

Sir William Harcourt, Chancellor of the Exchequer, introduced the budget in the House of Commons on Thursday evening. He stated that the expenses of 1885–6 were £1,393,327 less and the receipts £1,208,699 less than the estimates made by Mr. Childers a year ago, making an actual deficit of £2,642,943, instead of £2,827,171, as estimated. The diminution in revenue was most marked in the case of alcohol, the receipts derived from which were £971,000 below the estimate and £1,179,000 below the receipts in 1884–5. Within a decade there has been a decrease in revenue from alcohol of £4,500,000. This has been due to changes in the habits of the people, and has been concurrent with an enormous increase in revenue derived from comforts of life. The falling off in receipts from alcohol has been reduced about one-half by increased receipts derived from tea, tobacco, and fruits. For the fiscal year of 1886–7 the expenditures are estimated at £90,428,599, and the revenue at £89,885,000. It is proposed to meet the deficit by taking £800,000 from the £6,750,000 applicable to the reduction of the national debt, which has been reduced £30,000,000 in the past five years.

The Queen's Proctor has decided to intervene in the Dilke case as a private person. Sir Charles will call a great meeting of his supporters to hear his statement.

Sampson Low, the oldest London publisher, died on Friday at the age of eighty-nine.

The Greek Chamber of Deputies has voted all the bills for military preparations. The Government on Saturday sent an unconciliatory reply to the note of the Powers, insisting upon the execution of the Berlin Treaty.

The General commanding the Greek troops on Zarkos Heights, which command the Plain of Larissa, was summoned by the Turkish General on Sunday to withdraw from that stronghold. The Greek General flatly refused to withdraw. The Turkish force, consisting of 7,000 men and several batteries, thereupon advanced to the foot of the heights. Greek troops are being pushed to the frontier as rapidly as possible.

It is rumored that the Greek Consul at Candia, Crete, with the approval of his Government, has been actively engaged in plotting a rebellion among the people, a majority of whom are Greeks, against Turkish authority, and that the Consuls of the other Powers have asked their respective Governments to interfere to prevent the movement from being carried out.

The Porte has been informed by Germany, Russia, and Austria that they are taking fresh steps to compel Greece to disarm.

England has sent a circular to the Powers proposing that if Greece does not disarm, the Powers cease diplomatic relations with her and blockade the Greek ports.

The Russian Ministry have ordered the chief authorities of all the universities in the empire at once to adopt means for the immediate and permanent suppression of all forms of political agitation by young students.

At 10:30 o'clock on Sunday morning, while the Bishop of Madrid was ascending the steps of the Cathedral, he was shot three times and fatally wounded by a priest who had recently been dismissed from the priesthood, and had vainly importuned the Bishop to be reinstated. The assassin was arrested and was followed by an immense crowd, who were only prevented from lynching him by gendarmes. The Bishop died on Monday.

MM. Ducquercy and Roche have been sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment for fomenting riots in the French mining districts.

A serious flood in Montreal has damaged property to the amount of $1,600,000.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHO ARE "THE LABORERS"?

THERE are about 11,000 men employed now on the Southwestern railroads who have taken the place of the strikers of their own free will, and the employers are satisfied with them, and the roads are doing a large business in the transportation of freight and passengers Nevertheless, we are hearing still from the Knights of Labor, through their officers, Mr. Powderly, Mr. Turner, Mr. Martin Irons, and others, not only that the strike is not over, but that the railroad companies are still engaged in the perpetration of some sort of wrong against a large body of laborers belonging to their organization, concerning which they are asking not only for arbitration but for some sort of Congressional interference. Now we know what they mean when they say the strike is not over. They mean that the men who struck six weeks ago have not gone back to work, and are not willing to do so until they are asked by the companies to return on their own terms. We see nothing reprehensible in this. No man ought to go back to work for either the Missouri-Pacific or the Texas-Pacific unless the terms offered by these corporations are satisfactory to him, and he thinks he can do no better.

But what wrong are the companies doing to the Knights of Labor, or to "labor" in general, or to the community at large? What is it that the Congressional Committee is going down to inquire into? About what did the Citizens' Committee propose arbitration the other day? What is it exactly that the Master Workman is complaining of? In like manner, what is it that O'Donnell and his Empire Protective Union have against the Third Avenue Street Railroad? The members of the Union have refused to work for the road because they do not like the terms of the service. This is their right. No one has any business to quarrel with their decision except their creditors or persons dependent on them for support. The company has accepted their decision and is employing other men, who are presenting themselves in great numbers, to take their places. What, then, are O'Donnell and his Union complaining of? What wrong is the company doing them? Why are they hanging about the road, and why has an immense body of police to be employed to keep the track clear, and prevent attacks on those men who are driving and conducting the cars?

These questions go to the bottom of the labor problem as now presented to the American public, and they cannot be considered too carefully or answered too clearly and distinctly. We believe that in its manner of answering them the American people will furnish almost as valuable a test both of their own temper and capacity, and of the strength of democratic institutions, as was furnished by their answer to the Southern challenge to take the field in defence of free labor. What they are now asked to do is to permit a few hundred thousand laborers, of foreign birth mainly, to set up a government to take the place of that already in existence in the State and nation, and enforce submission to it not by means of open warfare, but by a vast number of riots, assaults, and isolated acts of violence and disorder directed against persons and property, and other more petty annoyances, in the hope that the public may be worried into acquiescence.

What Powderly and Turner and Irons are trying to do in the West, and what O'Donnell and his men are trying to do here, is not to secure employment for labor, on terms satisfactory to the laborers—for a vast army of laborers stand ready to do and are doing the work which the strikers refuse—but to establish the rule that nobody has any right to be considered a laborer, or be employed as such, except members of their respective organizations. They want us to admit that the 11,000 men now employed by the Southwestern roads are not real laborers or entitled to sympathy or protection from the militia or the courts, and that the Knights of Labor should be allowed to make war on them with pistols, and knives, and brickbats, and drive them from their work, and rob their families of their support. They want us to admit, also, that members of their respective organizations, by merely becoming members, acquire a vested right to remain in such employment as they may happen to have at the time of joining, no matter what their behavior may be and whether the employer wants them or not, and as long as they please, on their own terms. This would convert every laborer's place into an office for life, on wages and hours of work fixed by himself, or, in other words, an office for which there has been no parallel in the history of mankind, except that of a military despot. It is only military despots who have ever made places for themselves, or determined how long they should hold them, and what their rate of pay should be, without consulting those who paid their salaries.

Does any sane man suppose that the American people are going to organize their business on a basis of this sort, and try to do the work of the nation through agents whom they can neither hire nor dismiss, and whose wages they cannot fix? We think it will be discovered, even by the most ignorant and simple-minded of the Knights before long, that the world is not going to be carried on in that way just yet, and that in considering the claims of labor and the interests of labor and the needs of labor, the American people will not overlook the vast army of the poor and unemployed, whose existence is revealed by every strike of the unskilled or slightly skilled. There is no claim to human sympathy and help arising out of poverty and readiness to work for a livelihood, which the men who take the place of strikers do not possess in a higher degree than strikers. It is they who are really "Labor," and it is they who present the true labor problem with which the philanthropist and legislator are called on to deal.

PARLIAMENTARY ANARCHY IN GERMANY.

THE latest debates in the German Reichstag—we refer to those already known to us *in extenso*—show more clearly, perhaps, than any previous discussions in that body how far parliamentary government is still from being a reality in Germany. In a lugubrious tone the aging Chancellor declares, on an occasion apparently least appropriate for political pathos, that he despairs of finding a support for the unity and power of the nation in its Parliament, the majority of which rests, and will undoubtedly continue to rest after many an election, on "fractions hostile to the Empire from necessity and principle." These fractions, which not only support but almost constitute the majority, are the Ultramontane Centre, the Socialists, the Poles, the Alsace-Lorrainers, and other Separatists, with whom the German-Liberals, themselves the warmest friends of German unity, generally coöperate in their opposition to what they consider Prince Bismarck's excessive demands of power or economic vagaries.

Being "convinced" of the untrustworthiness of the Reichstag for the defence of his creation, the Chancellor, as he frankly tells it, the more eagerly looks for firmer support in a well-provided army, and in finances little dependent upon legislative grants and the contributions of the single States. He sees dangers ahead—dangers threatened by socialism within and coalition without—expects soon to be removed from the helm, sees no successor who would continue his labors in his own way, and gently intimates that the constitutional structure might be exposed to serious shocks—after him; for himself, he would surely not lay hands on what he had helped to build. He once more recommends one of his pet financial measures, in these curious words: "I would still beg you to-day, though it might almost appear like irony, to accept the monopoly; by the monopoly you strengthen the Empire, by declining it you hurt the Empire."

This appeal, evidently as seriously meant as pathetic, did not prevent the complete defeat of the Government measure, and a few days later the warfare of fractions—which in the German Reichstag replaces the great party duels of other parliaments—was resumed on another occasion. The Minister of the Interior, Puttkamer, pleaded for the renewal of the Anti-Socialist Law for five years. The Centre party had proposed an amendment limiting the prolongation to two years. The Minister depicted the horrors of anarchic rioting just going on in the mining districts of Belgium, and upbraided the German-Liberals with defending a degree of freedom, of governmental impotence, which the bloody scenes in the neighboring kingdom proved to be fraught with perils of every kind. In the next minute he turned toward the Ultramontane opposition allies of the advanced Liberals, and twitted them with the remark that Belgium was "a thoroughly and truly Catholic country," that "ninety-nine per cent. of the strikers were true sons of their church," which thus proved as "little able to cope with certain agitations" as the Liberal Government. He then implored all parties to stand by their Emperor, who "had given his blood for bringing about this law, and who had expressly commanded the declaration before the nation's assembled council that no keener grief, no bitterer disappointment, could be prepared for him, in this late evening of his life, than to find himself deserted by the representatives of the nation in his attempt to maintain and secure the domestic peace." The leader of the Centre, Windthorst, took up the gauntlet, reproached

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Government with driving, by its exceptional decrees, the Catholic laborers into the ranks of the atheistic Social Democracy, at the same time inveighed against Belgian liberalism as a pernicious freemasonry, and thus wrestled at once, with his wonted volubility, with Conservatives and Liberals, Government and socialism, foe and ally. A Polish representative declared the opposition of his fraction to any prolongation of the law, protesting in the Polish interest against exceptional legislation in general, but also condemning the Socialist doctrines as subversive not only of State and Church, but of the principle of nationality, so dear to Poles.

This provoked the ire of Bebel, the aggressive Socialist chief, who began his harangue against the bill with an attack on the Poles, its most outspoken opponents. Then, assailing its advocates, he alluded, in the course of his invectives, to Stöcker's insinuation of a secret harmony between Socialists and Jews. This gave the famous court-preacher an opportunity to turn the discussion on Social Democracy into the anti-Semitic channel, and accuse a Jewish member of the Socialistic parliamentary group of hypocritically wearing on his back the badge of Social-Democratic principles. The Jew retorted by reminding Stöcker that tribunals before which his anti-Semitic agitation had brought him had branded his forehead with the mark of lying. Hänel, the most incisive German-Liberal opponent of the prolongation bill, characterized Stöcker as "the Bebel of religious intolerance and State Socialism." Bebel spurned his ally's comparison as an insult, Stöcker being a perjurer. A tilt between Socialists and Windthorst, both in opposition, followed, and the irregular skirmishing ended with a victory of the latter at the ballot, the two-year amendment being adopted. Thus the Ultramontanes, holding the balance of power between Conservatives and National-Liberals on one side and the German-Liberals and Social-Democrats on the other, and disposing of the vote of the Separatist fractions, again triumphed over Bismarck, who, however, assured the Reichstag, at the close of the debate, that what the Government failed to obtain now it would surely recover before the lapse of the two years. And, victorious or beaten in debate—such is German constitutionalism—the Government has always its way in fact.

ON LEARNING FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

In the last number of the *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement* M. Bréal has published a lecture on learning foreign languages, in which he has attacked a practical problem in a practical way, not as a philologian, not as a determined tracker down of etymologies, not as an ingenious restorer of such dilapidated linguistic monuments as the 'Song of the Arval Brethren,' but, to use his own expression, as a *paterfamilias*. Literature, philology he ruthlessly puts aside, and absolutely discards all the cumbrous apparatus of grammar. The object he proposes is the practical acquisition of German, of English, Italian, Spanish. Philological study of these idioms he considers a waste of time for the young. Greek and Latin are the true educational gymnastic. English and German are needed as means of communication, of exchange among the peoples. He denies the familiar assertion that the French have not the bump of languages. The Minister of Public Instruction has recently tried the experiment of sending young Frenchmen abroad to learn English and German, and the experiment has had the happiest results. From Germany, from England, the students have brought back not only a good knowledge of German, of English, but enlarged views. They have learned to appreciate different methods of thinking, reasoning, living. Of course the state cannot repeat this experiment on a large scale, but the system of exchanges so common between French-Swiss and German-Swiss families is recommended as an admirable and economical method of training young girls in foreign languages. M. Bréal admits that this is somewhat repugnant to French ways, but France has widened her ways so much in the last thirty years that we may look forward to greater latitude in this direction also. To those who can go abroad he gives the eminently sensible advice not to go abroad in order to pick up the language, but in order to study something definite, to work at something definite, whether banking at Frankfort, bookselling at Leipsic, brewing of beer or Aeginetan sculptures at Munich. You will learn banking, bookselling, beer-brewing, you will make yourself an authority on the origin of Greek art, and you will be a capital German scholar to boot.

The trouble that a philologian has to encounter is that he carries with him the sense of his profession. He is too much bent on being grammatical; and M. Bréal tells an amusing story of the efforts of a young French professor who betook himself to Germany equipped with the orthodox apparatus for the acquisition of the language. Endowed with a good memory and a prodigious power of work; he mastered his grammar, the 248 irregular verbs and all, in the space of a week. Then he put his knowledge to the test by going to a lecture; but he found, to his dismay, that he could not catch even one grammatical form, not even one of those rascally irregular verbs he had acquired with so much pains. His next point of attack was the vocabulary. Grammar is only the skeleton, words the flesh and blood. So he addressed himself to the radicals of the German language first, and finding a book that offered him a complete assortment of German radicals, he devoured it eagerly and digested his 1,000 roots in four days. The result was not a whit better. His next resource was Ollendorff—'German in Ninety Lessons.' Ninety lessons—that means three months. Why not take three lessons a day? In thirty days Ollendorf is his—but not the German language. Jacotot, Robertson, Ploetz follow—all to no purpose. At last he conceived the heroic purpose of committing the dictionary to memory. 30,000 words cannot be considered a trifle. Still, at the rate of 1,000 words a day, a dictionary can be appropriated in a month. The failure was as absolute as before, and, to crown his humiliation, he met certain French artisans who had crossed the border with him and had learned German while working at their trade. The young professor finally succeeded in learning German, and afterwards published his experiences for the benefit of the world.

Still, with all respect for M. Bréal, the time spent on grammar, roots, Ollendorff, and dictionary was not all wasted. The true way to learn a language is to take it in at every pore, and the philological pore is not to be despised. A mature man cannot become a child again, although it is very true that in order to learn a language well one must get into childlike ways of mimicry. People who are plagued with a profound sense of their personal dignity never learn to speak a foreign language well. Of course M. Bréal is too sensible a man not to emphasize the fact that this infantine knowledge of language goes even more rapidly than it comes. A child learns a language perfectly in a year, and forgets it totally in six months; and those who learn languages as children do unlearn them with corresponding facility.

Much that M. Bréal says on the education of the ear, on the mastery of phrases, is excellent. For English as against German he has much to say. English is much nearer akin to the French than is German. It is the French form of the Germanic mind. It is a beautiful language, "all sinew and muscle, a language that seems to have resolved the problem of packing away the maximum of *esprit* in the minimum of matter"; and the short monosyllables which the German poet Platen detested, carry to M. Bréal's mind a sense of plenitude and strength. At the same time, he acknowledges that, owing to a false start, he has never been able himself to do much with it practically, and he unconsciously illustrates the trickiness of our idiom by supposing a child equally at home in English and in French to address his English-speaking mother with the startling phrase, "Let me come on your knees" (*Prends-moi sur tes genoux*)—which is, being interpreted, "Take me on your lap."

TOLSTOI AND MONTAIGNE.

The old and the new are the same: the wisdom of the ancients repeats itself in every age; the thirteenth century instructs the nineteenth, and the men of the sixteenth century are our brothers. In every land and in every generation are born those souls who, hearing the word of God, follow after it and hold commune with it

> "——on their behalf
> Who, on the plain, with dance amain
> Adore the Golden Calf."

Tolstoi to-day in Russia, Garrison yesterday in America—with only the differences of accent and emphasis belonging to each personality and the circumstances of each—utter truths eighteen hundred years old and far older yet, the truths of the Sermon on the Mount. The striking similarities between these two thinkers must have occurred to every one who in this last year has read Mr. Garrison's Life and Count Tolstoi's 'Ma Religion,' for it is conspicuous; and it is extremely interesting.

Not less interesting is a resemblance to be found between Tolstoi and Montaigne. Completely unlike as is the tone of their minds, many of Montaigne's pages might be used as mottoes for Tolstoi's chapters. For us who have not suffered nor struggled as the sensitive and high-hearted Russian has done, who have not known the moral strife he has endured, there may be a fuller sense of kinship and sympathy with Montaigne. Yet if we better understand his position of thought, none the less—all the more, in fact—there is a curious, one may even say a profound, satisfaction in being led from his point of view to the neighboring, though narrower, outlook of our coetanean, and in adjusting our knowledge of life to the discovery and acceptance of all which they see in common.

While the strongest moral conviction of Tolstoi's mind is the belief in non-resistance to evil-doers, his greatest moral struggle, it is evident, has been in delivering himself from all dominion of human authority; and this freedom from social control he must regard, though he does not distinctly say so, as not only the right but the duty of every man. Here, perhaps, a colder and keener intelligence would find one of the weak points of his system; but no heart can deny the force and power of his indictments against the Church (all creeds) as a teacher of evil doctrines, and against the State (all governments) as an inciter to evil deeds, and against Society (all civilization) as a promoter of evil passions. War is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the very embodiment of the things condemned by this man's rectitude. In his eyes, a righteous war there cannot be: a war for religion, a Christian army, are self-contradictory terms, and a war of patriotism is founded on delusion. A soldier's profession, however disguised by genius and by honors, is at bottom simply homicide. All this is summed up in two words by Montaigne: he speaks of war as "cette maladie humaine." A "malady" can be neither Christian, nor patriotic, nor honorable.

In a passage of eloquent emotion Tolstoi contrasts Jesus saying, "Take thy cross, and follow me," with the vilest of gold-laced men, whose business is to kill his fellow-creatures, saying, "Take, not your cross, but your knapsack and rifle, and march to a suffering death." He continues (we translate from the French version):

"Abandoning their families, their wives, their children, tricked out in grotesque habiliments, and placing themselves at the orders of the first comer of higher rank, starved, frozen, exhausted by forced marches, they go, not knowing whither, like a herd of cattle to the slaughter, . . . till the moment comes when they are placed within the range of cannon balls and bullets, and commanded on their side to kill men of whom they know nothing. They kill and are killed. And none of them knows why or wherefore. It needs but for some ambitious leader to brandish his sword and shout to them sounding words, and they precipitate themselves headlong to death."

Break off here in the middle, and turn to Montaigne:

"In our wonted actions, of a thousand there is not one that has regard to ourselves. He whom you see scrambling up the ruins of that wall, furious and beside himself, exposed to so many gunshots: and that other, all scarred, frozen, and pale with hunger, resolved to die rather than open the way to him—think you they are there for themselves? It is for one whom, perchance, they have never seen, and who gives himself no concern about them, but lies sunk the while in sloth and pleasure."

And then he asks: "Who does not readily exchange health, peace, and life for renown and glory, the most useless, vain, and false coin that we pass current?" This is the very keynote of a large part of Tolstoi's book; as the first clause of the just quoted passage is merely a different wording of one of his repeated phrases—"In our wonted actions, of a thousand there is not one that has *regard to ourselves*."

> "For custom lies upon us with a weight
> Heavy as frost and deep almost as life."

It was custom which imposed upon Tolstoi in his youth the practice of duelling, and other conditions which he refers to and depicts in this striking passage:

"In my life—exceptionally fortunate in a worldly point of view—I can count so many sufferings endured for the doctrine of the world, that they would equal one or another martyrdom for the doctrine of Jesus. All the most painful moments of my life, beginning with the orgies and duels of student days, my army life in war time, the illnesses and abnormal and insupportable conditions I have passed through [one notes and corrects here a self-evident mistranslation in the French], all this was martyrdom endured for the doctrine of the world. Yet I speak of my own life, one, as I say, exceptionally fortunate in a worldly point of view. How many martyrs have endured and are enduring at this moment, for the doctrine of the world, sufferings which it would be difficult to count up!"

"Je vouldrois," says Montaigne, "qu'on me feist raison de ces loix d'honneur qui vont si souvent chocquant et troublant celles de la raison." It is such martyrs who, as life darkens to its end, must question—

> "What was that word which once sufficed alone for all,
> Which now I seek and never can recall?
> I know not; I will do the work the world requires,
> Asking no reason why, but serving its desires;
> Will do for daily bread, for wealth, respect, good name,
> The business of the day."

"Alas!" they ask, "is that our one duty?"

> "And then, as weary of in vain renewing
> This question, thus their mournful thought pursuing,
> 'I know not. I must do as other men are doing.'"

The thought which Lessing expressed in the phrase, "The Christian religion has been tried for eighteen hundred years; the religion of Christ remains to be tried," is the thought which Tolstoi's book but amplifies and insists upon. And here, too, Montaigne has the precedence. "If this ray of divinity," he says—that is, a lively faith in God—"if this ray of divinity at all touched us, it would appear in everything about us; not only our words but our works also would be pervaded by the light and lustre of it; all that went out from us would be seen to be illuminated by this noble enlightenment." But, in truth, he adds, comparing the life of Christians with that of other human societies, "this so divine and celestial order distinguishes Christians only by their language!" We remain behindhand "there, where, on account of the advantage of our religion, we ought to shine in excellence at an extreme and incomparable distance; and men should say, 'How just they are, how charitable, how good; it is because they are Christians.' . . . The peculiar token of our truth of doctrine should be our virtue of life." Just afterward he says: "Some men persuade the world that they believe what they do not believe; others, in greater number, persuade themselves so; not understanding what it is to believe." Tolstoi says, "Our existence finds itself now in such contradiction with the doctrine of Jesus that we have the greatest difficulty in understanding it."

Once more the words of the poet already quoted (Clough) enforces other utterances of the writers we are especially considering. He speaks for many men when he cries:

> "Ah me! this eager rivalry of life,
> This cruel conflict for preëminence,
> This keen supplanting of the dearest kin,
> Quick seizure and fast unrelaxing hold
> Of vantage-place; the stony hard resolve,
> The chase, the competition, and the craft
> Which seems to be the poison of our life,
> And yet is the condition of our life!
> To have done things on which the eye with shame
> Looks back, the closed hand clutching still the prize!
> Alas! what of all these things shall I say?
> Take me away unto thy sleep, O God!"

Such a life may be compatible, as Tolstoi asserts, with the Christian religion—the religion of the Christian churches—but not with the religion of Christ. As a follower of Jesus, he says of himself: "I have understood in what my true good consists; I have *faith* in that. . . . *Not only I have faith that I ought thus to live*, but I have faith that if I thus live, and only so, my life will have for me all possible meaning, and will be reasonable, joyful, and indestructible by death"—since, as Montaigne says, "there is nothing so easy, so gentle, and so favorable as the divine law."

There is a remarkable passage of Montaigne which at first glance we might seem to have advanced three hundred years away from, but Tolstoi indicates that we should err in so thinking. Montaigne, speaking of the evil qualities in us, declares that they are connected with the fundamental conditions of our life, and continues:

"In the same way, in all civilizations, there are necessary offices not only vile but vicious. . . . Though they become excusable since they are needful, and general necessity effaces their true quality, they must yet be left to those citizens . . . who sacrifice their honor and their conscience as others sacrifice their lives for the good of their country. . . . The public good requires that there should be traitors, and liars, and murderers: let us resign these duties to people more obedient and more supple than we."

"One has but to study the complicated mechanism of our modes of government," says Tolstoi, "to recognize that . . . one set of men make laws, another set apply them, a third harden others . . . to unreflecting and passive obedience; the fourth, these very men so hardened, become the instruments of all kinds of violence." Or, as he has before declared, no judge would execute his own sentences, while no officer of the army, no private soldier, save from the influence of discipline, would even wound one single man, much less kill them by the hundreds and sack their towns. "The distinctive trait of civilized man," he avers, "is that he does through obedience what is considered by the larger number as iniquitous, that is, as opposed to conscience."

We come to a close only for want of space. There remain countless instances of likeness in the thoughts of these two meditative minds. Those who care to pursue the subject may compare what they say concerning the advantages of the simple over the learned, of the poor over the rich; concerning prayer and immortality; about punishments, or even about such minor matters as commentaries. At the last moment we can but beg their readers to remember, in connection with Tolstoi's admirable pages on the difference of our feeling towards our compatriots and towards foreigners, (as with Garrison's generous declaration, "My country is the world, my countrymen are all mankind"), Montaigne's delightful passage: "I look upon all men as my compatriots, and embrace a Pole as cordially as a Frenchman, holding in less high regard the national bond than the universal and common one."

ON THE EVE OF GLADSTONE'S SPEECH.

LONDON, April 8, 1886.

BEFORE three hours are over, Mr. Gladstone's scheme of home rule will be known to the whole world. Americans may, perhaps, read with interest a few notes on the condition of English opinion at a momentous historical crisis. My aim at this moment is simply to state what I believe to be facts; but any readers of the *Nation* who may peruse what I write should bear in mind two considerations: the first is, that though my aim is simply to state the truth, I cannot profess to be without a bias. My conviction is, that any scheme of home rule or federalism is opposed to the interests of England, and this belief is, I know, certain to affect both my observations and the inferences they suggest. The second consideration is, that in a period of revolution—and no one can conceal from himself that England is passing through a revolution, even though it be one accomplished under forms of law—phases of sentiment change from day to day, almost from hour to hour. The opinion of this week is not the opinion of a week ago; it may differ widely from the prevalent opinion of a week hence. Add to this, that I am not "inside politics," and can make no claim whatever to any wide knowledge of the different classes which make up the large world of England. My observations, whatever their worth, are based on knowledge of the sentiment prevalent in what, for want of a better term, I can best describe as the class of lawyers and university men. Subject to these remarks, which I most earnestly request any reader to bear in mind when judging of this or any other letter by me on current politics, I note with some confidence the following features in the condition of public opinion.

First.—The educated classes have as a body withdrawn their confidence from Mr. Gladstone.

This assertion will, I know, be disputed; it is one of those statements which, from their nature, do not admit of absolute proof. For myself I feel no doubt of its correctness, but I am perfectly aware that it would be challenged by Gladstonian Liberals. (The expression, by the way, "Gladstonian Liberal," is singularly characteristic of the time, and suggests many reflections.) The facts on which I rely in support of my contention are (*inter alia*) the changed tone of journals which, like the *Spectator*, the *Guardian*, or the *Scotsman*, used at one time to place unhesi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tating faith in the Premier, and even more the altered attitude of the vast majority of my own friends, many of whom have always been and still are strong Liberals. In the matter of home rule, moreover, this change of sentiment is, at any rate, perfectly natural. Home rule has never been what I suppose Americans would call a plank of the Liberal platform. Mr. Gladstone's policy may be wise or foolish, but it is undoubtedly a new policy; it is his own; it is not the traditional policy of the Liberal party.

Secondly.—Mr. Gladstone's adherents in and out of the Government are almost wholly guided by two influences: their belief in Mr. Gladstone's statesmanship, and the difficulty which they see in governing Ireland on any plan not approved of by Mr. Parnell. No human being can suppose that the men who will vote for Mr. Gladstone's measure would themselves have proposed a policy of home rule; they have approved Mr. Gladstone's scheme because it is Mr. Gladstone's, and because it promises to get them out of a sort of political *cul de sac*.

Thirdly.—Confidence in the Conservative party does not exist. The way in which the Conservatives came into power; their utter incapacity to make up their own minds on the plain question whether they would support coercion or not; above all, their conduct in respect of Lord Spencer, has deprived them of all moral weight. Lord Randolph Churchill, moreover, is the only Tory statesman whose name is known to the people; and, whatever other feeling that name may inspire, it certainly does not inspire confidence.

Lord Hartington commands public respect. Whether he and his friends can form or guide public opinion, will be known in the course of the next three or four weeks. Neither he nor his associates have yet shown the capacity to lead the English democracy.

Fourthly.—The opinion of the electors is an unknown quantity.

This is really the consideration which ought to govern all speculation as to the probable course of events. Of excitement, either against or in favor of home rule, there has been up to the present moment not a trace; and the most probable, as well as, in my judgment, the most alarming, inference from this popular silence is the existence of widespread popular apathy. The danger of England, to judge from signs which, after all, are very possibly delusive, lies not in the violence but in the political indifference of a democratic electorate. It is possible that the class who predominate in the constituencies do not understand and are not interested by politics.

Fifthly.—The most melancholy, and it may be feared the most indisputable, characteristic of public sentiment is the absolute want of any strong moral enthusiasm either for or against the policy of home rule.

There is certainly some ground for supposing that by far the least popular of Mr. Gladstone's anticipated proposals is the scheme for compensating or buying out Irish landlords. No one can feel more strongly than I do the obvious objections to burdening the English taxpayer with a new load of taxation, but it certainly is not a cheering reflection that the one feature in the policy of home rule which seems to have immediately aroused disapprobation is the attempt to avoid treating one class of Irishmen with gross injustice. Home rule may, it is likely enough, be established, but on one point there must, I regret to say, be no mistake. This last concession to Ireland, if it be made, will be made in the main from no enthusiasm for justice, but from a sentiment of lassitude and despair.

Sixthly.—Till yesterday there certainly prevailed a widespread idea that Mr. Gladstone's proposals were doomed to defeat in the House of Commons. To-day there are some signs that his success in carrying his measures through the Lower House is at any rate not impossible. Mr. Chamberlain apparently seeks for reconciliation with the Prime Minister. Lord Hartington's conduct seems to give signs of hesitation. Mr. Gladstone's oratorical triumph is anticipated and perhaps to a certain extent discounted. But of all this the people of New York will, long before this letter reaches them, know far more than any Englishman can know at the present moment. All that can confidently be asserted is, that England is invited by her chief statesman to enter on a revolutionary policy, and that there is no sign that the invitation has as yet excited among the mass of the people either repugnance or enthusiasm.

A. V. Dicey.

TWO DAYS AFTER.

London, April 10, 1886.

Mr. Gladstone has spoken, and your readers are already in possession of his scheme of home rule. With all deference to the descriptive reporters, the speech was not equal, in point of eloquence, to the greatest of its author's previous efforts. His voice used to be more musical, his gestures more easy, his sentences more accurately rounded off. But the abatement of physical force seems to strengthen rather than diminish the personal influence of the veteran party chief. Will that influence be strong enough to secure a majority for the second reading of his bill? The Government whips speaks of a majority of fifty; others, less confident, will be content with twenty. Nobody supposes for a moment that the bill can become law in this Parliament. In the House of Lords there are, perhaps, not ten men, besides the members of the Government, whose votes can be counted on in support of any measure of home rule. Even in the Commons, it must be noted that all calculations based on the reception given to the home-rule scheme are of necessity partial. Land purchase is still to be faced, and when Mr. Gladstone comes to ask leave to add 120 millions sterling to the national debt, his majority may show a tendency to disperse. Many gentlemen seem to hope that they may be allowed to vote for home rule and against land purchase. But the Government cannot permit this without going back on its pledges. If land purchase is dropped, Lord Spencer will go, and his departure might just turn the scale as between the Liberal leaders who are out and those who are in.

Perhaps the most curious feature of the discussion, up to this point, is the unanimity with which the supporters of the scheme declare that it will not do in its present shape. If the bill is read a second time, it will be by the votes of men who have undertaken to cut it all to pieces in committee. Many English Liberals declare that they regard the scheme with general approval, but at the same time they do not wish the Irish members to be removed from Westminster. But if the Irish members are not removed, what becomes of the Government scheme? It is perfectly certain that Ireland cannot furnish 281 elected members for a Dublin Parliament, in addition to 103 members of the Imperial Parliament. Mr. Parnell, again, is in a mood of general approval, but he objects to the constitution of the proposed Parliament; he objects to the financial part of Mr. Gladstone's scheme; he objects to the part which concerns the constabulary. If all these portions of the scheme are to be left out or seriously modified, what will be the final shape in which the bill will be presented for the consideration of the Lords? It is odd, and rather ominous, that Mr. Parnell and Mr. Healy are so ready to agree to their own exclusion from the British Parliament; odd, because in doing so they drop the weapon of obstruction which they have flourished over our heads during the last ten years; ominous, because it looks as if they were disposed to think that this measure of Mr. Gladstone's may open a way for them to walk out of the British Empire altogether. Nobody can suppose that Mr. Parnell will be permanently satisfied with the position which that measure assigns to his country—the position of a colony, paying a heavy tribute to the Empire, but taking no part in the direction of imperial policy. If Ireland is dissatisfied with her position when she gets home rule, there will be only two courses open to her: she may agitate for complete separation and national independence, or she may enter into some kind of federal agreement with England. The latter course was suggested by Mr. Healy in his speech of last night. But if the alternative—separation or federation—ever has to be placed before the Irish people, who will be our guarantee to insure that they will choose federation?

It is impossible to describe or even to indicate the cross-currents of English opinion at the present moment. I note that some Radicals are beginning to grumble over the loss of the Irish vote, because they have been counting on that vote to assist them in pressing forward English measures in which they are interested. Other Radicals, perhaps better informed, refuse to admit the cogency of this argument. They point out that the Irish vote has never been Radical or Tory or anything else that is consistent. It is usually cast in favor of any project of State Socialism; it is therefore a factor in the development of the new Radicalism with which Mr. Chamberlain has hitherto been identified. But the Irish vote is also emphatically a Catholic vote, hostile to religious equality, hostile also to the policy of the Elementary Education Acts. When it is remembered that Mr. John Morley made his first appearance in practical politics as a strenuous opponent of denominational schools, we need not wonder that he is now doing his best to exclude the representatives of Catholic Ireland from the House of Commons. If he succeeds, of course he must resign himself to making the principle which he condemns all-powerful in Ireland itself. The clergy have not lent their aid to the Nationalist movement for nothing, and we may be sure that a native Parliament will show no unwillingness to honor the drafts of Archbishop Croke. The Protestant churches of Ireland look with dismay to the prospect before them, and the Presbyterians have been especially active in endeavoring to rouse a feeling against home rule among their co-religionists in England and Scotland. They have met with a fair measure of encouragement, especially in Scotland. The Presbyterian ministers there have, up to the present time, been among the most ardent admirers and faithful followers of Mr. Gladstone, but it is already becoming evident that some of them are shaken in their allegiance, and if the cry of "Protestantism in danger" were once boldly raised, it is possible that the response may be loud enough to alarm the Liberal leaders. Among the "guarantees" of Mr. Gladstone's scheme will be the clause prohibiting the establishment or endowment of any church in Ireland. The clause may be sufficient to prevent the Roman Catholic clergy from installing themselves in the position left vacant by the Church Act of 1869. It will not prevent them "exalting a mitred front in Courts and Parliaments" or from working the national schools, and possibly the whole public service, on principles of exclusion and denominational preference.

By far the strongest influence in favor of the proposed change in our Constitution is the feeling that a change has become inevitable. In the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first place, there are not a dozen men in the House of Commons who respond to Lord Hartington's suggestion that the question of Irish government ought to be considered apart from the interests of English parties. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that any party will ever rise superior to the temptation of the Irish vote. Lord Hartington himself is perfectly sincere in making his appeal, and he is also capable of acting on it. But then his independence is based on moderation almost amounting to indifference. He is not eager to be in office; he is not ardently devoted to any particular course of policy and legislation; and, therefore, he has not, for the great mass of electors, the same attraction as Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Chamberlain. On the Conservative side, there is certainly no man capable of taking up the Irish question in an impartial spirit. Lord Randolph Churchill is hampered by past indiscretions, and in any case he is not likely to forego any opportunity of "dishing the Whigs" that may come in his way. As for his associates on the front Opposition bench, their attitude throughout this controversy has been one of collapse and bewilderment. If Disraeli—the Disraeli of 1873—were in the House of Commons to-day, there would be a "Conservative reaction" setting in all over the country. At present there are no signs of any such movement, and the Liberals fight their battles out among themselves in untroubled security.

Again, there is much force in the argument that the alternative before us now is between home rule and coercion. If we refuse to concede a Parliament to Ireland, the government of that country will be a most disgusting business for many years to come. We are so tired of Crimes Acts, and Arms Acts, and Peace Preservation Acts, that a strong impulse has come over us to give up the task, and let Irishmen go away and coerce one another. If the Irish Parliament failed to keep order, there would, of course, be a revival of the old sentiment of ascendency—possibly even a demand for the withdrawal of the Great Charter we are now asked to concede. But until it is granted, Englishmen will be disposed to take a hopeful view of matters, and to assume that, for their own sakes, the emancipated Irish will preserve some tolerable measure of discipline among themselves.

There are still a few, but only a few, Liberals who believe that Ireland might be governed without a Peace Preservation Act, on the lines of the existing Constitution. We have tried many experiments with that unhappy country; we have never tried to govern it just as England and Scotland are governed. Within Great Britain, our statesmen are powerful because they are in contact with the people; in Ireland they never address the people directly at all. Mr. Gladstone has been for the last ten years the rival of Mr. Parnell, and Mr. Parnell has beaten him all along the line. If English statesmen wish to prevail against Irish agitators, why do they never attempt to fight the agitators on their own ground with their own weapons? Our political leaders never address a meeting in Ireland, unless, perhaps, a carefully packed meeting of Protestants at Belfast; they take no pains to see that their acts are fairly placed before the people in the press. They give up the field to speakers like Mr. Biggar and papers like *United Ireland*, and then they are surprised to find that they have no influence on Irish opinion! But these, as I said before, are the views of a small minority—they are not the views of "practical politicians." R.

Correspondence.

POLITICS AND FINANCE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: While the interest of this country, as well as Great Britain, is centred upon Mr. Gladstone's great speeches upon home rule and land purchase, there has quietly taken place (sandwiched, as it were, between them) a proceeding which, as an example, is quite as important for the United States. On Thursday evening Sir William Harcourt, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, brought in the annual budget. The expenditure was put at £90,428,599, and the revenue at £89,885,000, leaving a deficit of £543,599. It was proposed to take £800,000 from the fund for reducing the national debt, which would leave a surplus of £257,000. The balance is therefore adjusted within little more than one million upon 450, or about one-quarter of one per cent. Of course, when it comes to committee of supply, the details may be varied, and if Parliament starts a new enterprise, the Chancellor of the Exchequer must find the money. Some items of revenue may also vary from the estimate. But, the House having accepted the budget, the basis of finance is settled for the year.

Let us now turn to Congress. A tolerably correct estimate of revenue is probably to be found in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, but he cannot estimate expenditure because he has nothing to do with it. The appropriations are made without reference to revenue, unless with a full purpose of getting rid of it, and while it was bad enough when they were in the hands of one committee, now that they are at the mercy of six or more, no human being can say whether the next fiscal year will show a surplus or a deficit, or whether, instead of redemption of debt, the Treasury, with all its enormous revenue, may not be in the market to borrow money.

That which makes the management of the British national finances, what it unquestionably is, the first in the world, is not the great wealth of the nation nor any special conservatism or economy, but the simple fact that the whole business, on both sides of the account, is left to one man, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who manages it as if it were his private purse; Parliament never amending a money bill, but only saying aye or no—in other words, having a veto. But as an offset to this great power, the responsibility is so strict that upon the smallest defeat the Chancellor is bound to resign, as when Mr. Lowe was beaten in a proposal to put a tax on matches.

What the finances of the United States need, more than tariff reform, more than payment of the debt, more than stoppage of silver coinage, more than uniform currency, is—a head. That the Secretary of the Treasury should at least take a part in the public discussion of the subject is so obviously for the public interest that it would have been put in practice long ago, were it not that it is by no means so much for the interest of the private combinations in the lobby, which practically rules both Congress and the finances. G. B.

Boston, April 19, 1886.

PUBLIC OPINION AS EDUCATED BY THE KNIGHTS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In pursuing your investigations of the labor question, now so prominently before the country, you might obtain confirmation of the quick change in public opinion where the strikers actually possess the city, by a review of the situation of affairs in Sedalia, Mo., during the month past. From private letters and a stray number of the Sedalia *Democrat* of the 6th instant, it appears that the public sentiment of that town has undergone the change. From sympathy with the strikers the townspeople became so wrought up and dismayed by the overbearing conduct of the striking men in that "be-knighted" place, as to call a citizens' meeting for the purpose of organizing a Law and Order League. When the meeting took place there were present a large number of the strikers, whose noisy demonstrations prevented any business from being transacted, and overawed all save one Captain Stevens (I am not sure of the name's spelling), who arose and made a strong speech in favor of quiet and good order. While the meeting apparently accomplished nothing, yet a week later its results were shown in the city elections. There were already regular nominees of both political parties in the field; but a few days before the election the *Democrat* suggested Captain Stevens as a candidate for Mayor of the city on a "Citizens'" ticket, inviting all good law-loving voters to support him. Meantime the Republican candidate had joined the order of the Knights of Labor, presumably for political effect. Captain Stevens (a Democrat, by the way) was elected by a large majority, receiving something like 700 votes out of a total poll of 1,200, the regular Republican and Democratic candidates dividing the remainder.

And now the people, grown suddenly bold, on knowing their strength, are jubilant, and the Sedalia newspapers are saying things, and printing headlines in large type, about the Knights of Labor that would cause a paper elsewhere to be instantly boycotted.—Yours truly, B.

Pittsburgh, Pa., April 13, 1886.

WHAT THE KNIGHTS WILL ACCOMPLISH.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: As an example of the oppression exercised by the Knights of Labor, not only on the employers but the workmen as well, I give the following recent occurrence at Albany:

Mr. Young, a boss mason, had working for him a number of non-union masons. Going to one of the brick-yards to buy materials for a building he had contracted to erect, he was told that this yard, as well as all others in Albany, had received word from the Knights of Labor that if they sold brick to Mr. Young, they would be boycotted; consequently his order would not be filled. Mr. Young found the other dealers in brick under the spell of the same unmanly fears, and could not buy, in a market containing quantities of it, the material he must have to commence a job he was under contract to finish at a specified time not far distant.

After talking the matter over with his men, they all decided that the only thing for them to do was to join the Knights of Labor as the condition on which they could get work and their employer could fill his contract. Application was therefore made to the proper officers, and the names of the masons presented for membership at the first meeting. The response of the union was, that in order to punish these men for their contumacy in not joining the order sooner, they would have to pay $50 each to be admitted; and if this were not done, they could get work neither in Albany nor elsewhere. With help from their friends and Mr. Young, the men scraped together $25 each, which they handed in as a down payment; the Knights chivalrously allowing the remainder to be made up in weekly instalments. This arranged, the prohibition was withdrawn from the weak-kneed brick-dealers, and Mr. Young was granted permission to buy his materials.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED.

It will be curious to see what Mr. Powderly and his brethren in command will do when it becomes necessary for them to come down from the occupation of ordinary strikes, boycotts, and destruction of property, to the humble task of providing wages for their dupes from the industries they are so busily engaged in crippling. This task will be theirs at no distant day, even should the authorities persist in their suicidal course of sympathy with the violators of the law, and permit conspiracies, arson, and murders to be planned and directed with impunity by men known to them. The workmen, of course, do not look ahead, and fancy that the general yielding to their demands that wages shall be raised, hours of labor (even reasonable ones) lessened, and the general control of business put into their hands, including the use of the employers as a means of forcing non-union men into the ranks of the Knights of Labor—that all this, because it is going on with a rush now, is to last always. They judge that their blind obedience to the commands of their executive committees will always continue to obtain the concessions from employers they exact. Demands which were reasonable and just in their early history are becoming more and more arrogant. Each success seems a stepping stone to more extravagant demands, and a feeling is rapidly growing that every employer is the natural enemy of his workmen, and it is a righteous act to get everything out of him that force or intimidation can gain.

Nothing is more certain, however, than that the time will come, and ere long, when people who have money (and they will not be found among the bone and sinew of the Knights of Labor) will withdraw it from business operations which are at the mercy of a lot of ignorant irresponsible demagogues. Manufacturers, contractors, and master artisans of all kinds will withdraw their capital from active use so soon as they become convinced, that, in remaining employed, it, with the industries it creates, is at the risk of the vagaries and whims of an Irons or Powderly, to say nothing of the numerous underlings of these arch conspirators. This process of withdrawal is already begun. Factories are closing, and preparing to do so as soon as existing contracts are filled and materials on hand converted; new enterprises are abandoned or arrested in their progress; and capital generally is preparing to retire from operations of which its owners are asked to give the control to those whom it employs. When this withdrawal and hoarding shall have gone on a few months more, and the demands for labor will only yield employment to say 75 per cent. of the working members of the Knights of Labor, what will be the condition of the leaders who have brought their fellows to this condition by blindly obeying their commands?

The heads of the Knights of Labor have taken a course which can only result in anarchy or their own downfall. We may—through the imbecility, or worse, of our politicians and rulers—have a taste of the first, or an approach to it, before we are through; but, were all their influence openly thrown in with the agitators, inexorable natural law, and the underlying, though often deeply hidden, common sense of the people will eventually come to the rescue, and relegate the Powderlys and Ironses to their natural obscurity, unless, indeed, they fall victims to those they have so long robbed and humbugged under pretext of friendship. D. S.

Brooklyn, April 17, 1886.

THE CLEANLINESS OF CHINAMEN.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I am tempted to a comment upon your editorial of April 1 on the Chinese question. It so happens that I have had to do with quite a number of Chinese laborers on this Pacific Coast, and have come to a fairly intimate knowledge of their habits and worth. The average California Chinaphobist would not admit as truth the testimony of Messrs. Coolidge and Babcock upon the personal cleanliness of the Chinese. And he would have fair show of reason on his side of the argument. The truth is, the Chinaman has but four senses—the fifth, smelling, seems to be practically lacking. We know how flat is his nose. Neither does his eye revolt from nastiness. The fragrance and coloring of a Maréchal Niel rose would be wholly wasted upon any Chinaman I ever saw. Their sense of touch is delicate. Herein lies the key to the Chinaphobist's position as regards the personal habits of the Chinese.

The man who can walk through the "Chinese quarter" of any California city, or even of any mining or railroad camp, and breathe contentedly, hath no nostrils. Yet, so far as their bodies, clothing, and bedding go, the Chinese laborers are infinitely cleaner and sweeter than are the laborers of any other nationality with whom I have had dealings. They do invariably wash their bodies and put on clean clothing after every day's work. But immediately thereafter these same men will step gingerly about from hut to hut on stepping-stones cast into such filth as kitchen slops and sewers produce. Then, again, they use largely of peanut oil in their cooking. The rank odor of this oil, of opium, and of scented tobacco, and of close atmosphere saturating their quarters forms a strange contrast to the clean-looking men. They won't *touch* filth. Neither do they see or smell it.

It is his lack of eye and nostril that leads this frugal, industrious, and satisfactory laborer into such great offending. I have myself so many times and so easily made these Chinamen keep their camps in sanitary trim, that I am satisfied that wherever the "Chinatown" of our California cities becomes a nuisance the fault lies wholly with the municipal authorities. All China believes in and obeys law willingly.—Respectfully, Dana Harmon.

Tucson, Arizona, April 9, 1886.

PROTECTION AGAINST THE POST-OFFICE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: On page 288, No. 1084, issue of April 8, you accuse Senator Wilson of not knowing what he was doing in introducing the bill to double postage on fourth-class matter. I am inclined to think he did, and that he contemplated a little more revenue in the interest of country merchants. It is well known here that a great quantity of merchandise is bought by "our own inhabitants"—consumers—from dealers in New York, Chicago, St. Louis, and the other commercial centres, to the detriment of the trade of our local merchants. This is not only because our people can buy cheaper, but also because they can, having a greater variety to select from, get more nearly what they want. With the present fourth-class matter mail facilities, four cents will send for and bring, for instance, a considerable variety of dry-goods samples. Some of these will represent prices which cannot be had at home, and the others will be marked enough below home prices to provide for cost of transportation by mail and leave a margin besides. Now an addition of sixteen cents per pound on merchandise would make trading away from home, through the mails, just that much more expensive, and would to that extent "protect" the local merchant. A local paper, in a recent editorial in favor of the Senator's bill, intimated that he had this lamentable state of affairs in view. As Mr. Wilson lives in this vicinity, and does not believe in a "tariff for revenue only," it seems probable that the local paper knew whereof it spoke. W. J. R.

Keokuk, Iowa, April 15, 1886.

THE FOURTH OF MARCH.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In your issue of March 29 you say, in the editorial on "The Fourth of March," that "the 4th of March . . . is not named in the Constitution." This is an error. The Constitution says that "if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President, whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the Fourth of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President." C. W. Lewis.

20 Bowdoin Street, Boston, April 9, 1886.

[It has been said a thousand times that the word "slavery" is not to be found in the Constitution. What would be thought of a person replying to that remark, "That is an error; the word slavery is to be found in the Constitution; the Constitution says, 'Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist within the United States'"?

The Constitution is an instrument which was framed in the year 1787, by a convention whereof George Washington was the President, and whereby the present Federal Government was established. The words which our correspondent quotes are not in the Constitution, but in the twelfth of the "Articles *in addition to* and amendment of the Constitution." This twelfth of the articles in addition was not adopted till the year 1804, seventeen years after the Constitution was framed, sixteen years after the "first Wednesday in March" was casually chosen by the Continental Congress, four years after the death of Washington, three years after three Presidents had been inaugurated on the 4th of March. Let us hope that our correspondent will now exert himself in writing and circulating a vigorous petition to Congress asking that for this most inconvenient and trouble-making day there be substituted the 30th of April as the day which shall terminate the second session of Congress, and upon which the inauguration of the President shall take place.—Ed. Nation.]

BIRD SLAUGHTER AND FEMALE ADORNMENT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The "Appeal to the Women of the Country in Behalf of the Birds," which appeared in *Science* for February 26, has already attracted so much attention that it may seem unnecessary to allude to it again. But it is an appeal which will need to be made often in order to produce any practical effect. Any one who has discussed the subject with women must realize the necessity of repetition. The greatest amount is needed before they will appreciate that it is a matter for which they are directly responsible, and therefore which it is in their power to encourage or condemn. Even then there is a long and weary distance between this appreciation and the determination to act upon it.

The indifference with which intelligent women treat the subject is almost incredible. In the face of all the recent advance in knowledge and culture made and claimed by women, this indifference seems a practical sarcasm. For, I take it, a custom of destroying life in order to ornament one's person comes under the head of bar-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

barisms, and certainly the continued gratification of vanity at the expense of public welfare is not consistent with a rational mind.

Still, there is the saving remnant, though in this case the remnant is so small that it may be doubted whether it will survive the "spring openings," notwithstanding the consolation offered in the way of cockades and pompons. And even should it survive, the women who compose it cannot but feel that any action on their part will be ineffectual. Always the question is asked, "What good will it do if I refuse to wear birds? I am only one against thousands." For this reason I suggest that a society be formed, such as the Plumage Section of the Selborne Society of London, for the Protection of Bird Life. The women then who do realize the necessity for such protection, and desire to take their part in it, will not feel that their action is fragmentary and unimportant. It is necessary to concentrate into one public movement the action of all those opposed to the custom of wearing dead birds, in order to produce any effective response to the appeal made in *Science*. Why should not the women of New York, as well as those of London, prove themselves independent of caprice, and capable of acting for public good and humane principles? L. C. R.

WASHINGTON, April 8, 1886.

THE FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I find in my *Nation* this evening a note from "C. M. M.," correcting a misstatement in my notice of the French Spoliation Claims. I can say nothing in explanation of it except that I really do not see how it happened. Such errors creep in, one can hardly say how. Two things which are easily distinguishable while one is examining them near at hand, sometimes seem to coalesce to the sight as one gets further from them, until, in some unguarded moment, the memory plays one a trick. In such cases, I can only thank quick-sighted readers, like your correspondent, for calling my attention to them. Few men are more indebted to others for kindnesses of the sort than I have been. I have never neglected to acknowledge them by letter when sent directly, and am glad to seize this excuse for repeating the acknowledgment in public.

ALEXANDER JOHNSTON.

PRINCETON, N. J., April 15, 1886.

AMIEL ONCE MORE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I feel compelled to graft my own criticism upon the otherwise judicious censure of a "Lover of Trustworthy Work," as found in the *Nation* of April 15. "Préau" may have meant "a small meadow" some centuries ago, but, as Littré states, is entirely obsolete in that sense, and is generally understood as the closed courtyard of a prison, a convent, or a school. In fact, Amiel thereby means one of those narrow yards, secluded from and against the outer world (and from the sunshine, too) by high, towering walls, such as may still be found occasionally in what remains of the Geneva of the sixteenth century, with some scanty grass, and, maybe, a rachitic tree or two—as you see, a most Calvinistic, even an ascetic, conception. In such greenish pits, the fellow-citizens (not to say the subjects) of the man with the goat's beard and tight skull-cap used to replenish their parsimonious lungs.

Let me state, also, as to what was said in the number of April 1, that I think the allusion made to F. Brunetière's criticism (in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*) somewhat rash. The unquestioned rank of that eminent writer places him far above such pettish feeling as seems to be ascribed to him in the *Nation's* article. The fact is that Amiel's idiosyncrasy—which may be defined as a kind of hypertrophy of the analytical powers, a morbid tendency which fatally leads to pessimism, as M. Paul Bourget so masterly demonstrates in his 'Essais de Psychologie contemporaine' (Paris: Lemerre, 1885)—this essentially modern form of moral neurosis is the very thing fit to irritate, yea, to exasperate, the nerves of a clear-headed, healthy representative (as M. Brunetière is) of that mainly Latin tradition that life *in itself* is worth living, independently of its transcendental possibilities. M. Brunetière belongs, body and soul, to the classical school; Amiel, willingly or not, was a "décadent." This is the true, the only explanation of M. Brunetière's severity; and I must say, as having myself had frequent and personal intercourse with H. F. Amiel, that the French critic's moral dissection of the "Protestant Buddhist" borders, in places, upon divination. Practically, M. Brunetière is entirely in the right, though he may outrun himself somewhat. No wonder! Amiel's perpetual wail would set on edge the teeth of any living creature who knows, as I do, and as M. Brunetière points out, that life had been a bountiful mother to that man, whose undeniable but only glory has been to follow and to foster, day by day, the progress of his own irremediable impotency. His posthumous success may be summed up in a few words; and any one who has read Paul Bourget's 'Essais' will support this conclusion: Amiel personified, even intensified, a moral disease, the cruel symptoms of which are branded in the very flesh of our generation.

A. DU FOUR.

CHARLOTTE, N. C.

THE NEW YORK ALUMNI OF YALE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The New York Alumni of Yale—sometimes spoken of as "The Delmonico Crowd," although their meetings have been held for two years at the University Club; and sometimes called "Young Yale," though the man who first fought under the designation graduated twenty-six years ago—have lately been made responsible by certain "conservative" writers for some things which they probably deprecate as much as anybody.

No one has authorized me to speak for them; but, being one of them, I may have as much right to represent them as any one of their critics has to misrepresent them. The principal general misrepresentations, though not restricted to the letter of your recent correspondent "M.," who wrote on "the test of numbers for colleges," are all contained in it. The first misrepresentation is, that the New York alumni "wish to take the management of internal affairs out of the hands of the Faculty, and put it back into the hands of the Trustees." This your correspondent illustrates by two special misrepresentations contained in the assertion that "already a trustee of the New York party has attempted to instruct the mathematical professors about the functions and arrangement of an astronomical observatory." Now, so far as the scientific "functions and arrangement" of the observatory are concerned, this statement conveys a distorted impression, and it conveys another in the implication that the business recommendation regarding the observatory to which the distorting statement refers, was solely the work of "a trustee of the New York party." It was the recommendation of three trustees, if I remember correctly, certainly of as many as two, one of them a Connecticut man.

I feel safe in saying that, whatever may be the aberrations of individuals, the vast majority of the New York alumni wish to take nothing "out of the hands of the Faculty." Their quarrel is not with the Faculty, but with the Corporation. What they do wish is, first, a change in the Corporation which will make it likely to elect a president of proved administrative capacity, they believing such a president to be Yale's greatest present need. Second, they want a corporation under which it will be possible to carry out the idea of unifying the University. This idea is well elaborated in Prof. Dwight's "Thoughts on the Future of Yale College" (I quote the title from memory). There is now great waste of power and duplication of work from lack of unification, but no president can carry out unification if he is saddled with a Corporation regarded with mistrust, as the present Corporation is, by the most vigorous and progressive department of the University—which department, fortunately, is independent of the present Corporation and intends to remain so. Third, they wish a corporation of men of affairs, who will, presumably, increase the general interest of men of affairs in the College, to its pecuniary benefit, and who will manage its pecuniary affairs and its status before the public as the pecuniary affairs and public status of any great corporation should, in these days of competition, be managed. A university, or even a church, has its business side; and it would be a fatuous man, indeed, who should deny that even the success of a church now depends largely upon good management of its business—so largely that men with business gifts are sought just as eagerly as men with spiritual gifts, for its corporation.

So far as it has been thought out, the belief is very general among the New York alumni of Yale that a college should be governed by two bodies, or rather by one body of two sections, each supreme in its own field, but helping the other to the common end—a Faculty supreme in educational matters, and a Corporation supreme in business matters. They think that for such a body of men as the Yale Faculty to depend for guidance and support in its business interests upon a Corporation of clergymen, is absurd; and some of them think that if the mere statement of that situation fails to carry conviction to any one, argument will be equally powerless.

They think, too, that a business corporation, free from "the theological bias," would recognize that the management of any machinery as vast as the educational machinery of Yale College has now grown to be, demands a kind and degree of ability absolutely inconsistent with the other kind and degree of ability which goes to the making of an eminent clergyman, and that the election of an eminent clergyman to the presidency is, on its face, an absurdity. The conditions of civilization making it an absurdity have been growing with geometrical rapidity with the advent of modern science and modern social conditions. Laudations of the administrations of Dwight and Day and Woolsey do not touch the case. Woolsey's administration covered the beginning of the new order of things. Under him, despite his tremendous character, the College barely held its place. There is not necessarily any discredit to President Porter, whose administration has been *in* the new order of things, in the demonstrated fact that under him the College has been losing its place. Those who want him succeeded by another man eminent in the talents and virtues of the clerical profession, simply invite faster relative loss.

If, against these positions, be cited the fact that Princeton, with an eminent clergyman at its head, has been forging ahead in the race with Yale, it is a sufficient answer, though there are others, that the business affairs of Princeton have been managed in New York. Whatever the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

facts may be on paper, there is no question what they have been in practice.

If, in answer to this, it be claimed that New York has not made a success of such share as it has had in the management of Yale, the answers are, first, a question of the correctness of the claim; second, that New York has not had a fair chance; and third, that its share—the share of all the alumni—in the Corporation is so limited that, despite some little scrimmages regarding it, many of the most capable of the alumni have felt absolutely indifferent to it. It is rather to get this share enlarged and to use it for the support of the Faculty, than to interfere with the Faculty, that their best attention is directed. That on the question of elective studies, the Faculty have lately needed support against the power set over them by the Corporation, such as the alumni wish to give them, and have had to force their position for themselves, and that on some other questions they have been beaten, are facts which had better not be blinked in these discussions.

There are those who say that a Corporation not dominated by the survivals of New England Puritanism would probably act or fail to act in about the same way that the present Corporation does. In support of this they draw a *non-sequitur* from a statement lately made by a lay member of the Corporation, at a Commencement dinner, to the effect that there had never been any difference between the clerical and lay members of the Corporation on any question brought up for discussion. The *non-sequitur* is that on no question that ought to be brought up are they apt to disagree; while a true *sequitur* is that, in the present state of education, if a clerical party and a lay party do not disagree, it is because living questions are neglected. The statement of the lay member of the Yale Corporation was not needed to prove that in that body they are.

Probably if any set of men on this planet are in the habit of looking facts square in the face, it is the active men of New York. And probably they are in a better condition to know why they send or conclude not to send their sons to any given college than any other men are to know it for them. Whatever opinions are held by that portion of Yale's graduates who happen to be in New York, presumably fit the facts at least as well as the opinions of her graduates elsewhere. But that the opinions of the New York alumni are restricted to themselves, or even that they are not largely shared by the most capable alumni everywhere, is as silly an intimation as the one generally accompanying it, that the methods which brought Yale College to her relative position of thirty years ago have been effective to keep her there, or can keep her even where she is now, in the future. X.

New York, April 13, 1886.

THE NUMBERS TEST FOR COLLEGES.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Some of us Western readers of the *Nation* have been highly edified by the "down East" discussion of a question that may be stated about thus: Ought the merits of a high school to be judged largely by the number of its students? When we read that some of the friends of Yale profess to see it declining because it does not keep pace in numbers with Harvard, we recognize the fact that the intellectual atmosphere of New England is impregnated with a something that is very familiar to us. One can find hundreds of people out this way, and they are pretty well informed people, too, who take the same view of our Western colleges. They never ask any question about them except, "How many students have they?" Yet it must be said, to the credit of some of the denizens of such half-civilized municipalities as Chicago, Cincinnati, or St. Louis, that they view this question in a different light, to say nothing of the wild tribes living further inland who do not believe that the efficiency of a troop of an educational establishment depends upon the numbers that compose it.

We find President Gilman's recent words very applicable to our case; and it now seems that they do not refer exclusively to us. He says: "I have heard it said that some men are possessed by a statistical devil. They can only think in figures; they will ask, in respect to a new acquaintance, how much he is worth; of a library, *how many volumes*; . . . of a college, how many students. I have known the expenses of an institution made a dividend, and the number of scholars the divisor, the quotient representing the cost of each pupil. . . . It is not the number but the quality of students which determines the character of a high school. It is important to count; it is better to weigh."

It is not too much to say that the comparatively large number of eminent men who are alumni of some of our small Western colleges is due in great measure to the determined maintenance of a high standard at the expense of popularity. They have acted on the principle that it is better to produce one Plato than a score or even a hundred like Alkibiades. Perhaps their conservatism has been a trifle excessive, but who will dare say, in the light of events, that if they have erred, it has not been in the direction of least danger? A college president in this State holds that the ideal number of students to a teacher is four, and that when a class contains a larger number his influence can no longer be maintained at its highest point of effectiveness. Among our Western colleges and "universities" those are, generally speaking, the most populous which give the time-honored degrees for almost any studies and in almost any quantity the student may choose. Those who speak and write, or strive in other ways, against these things, may be overborne by the present tide against them, but their zeal is kept alive by the confident hope that time will vindicate the wisdom of their efforts. The number is becoming gradually larger in America who admit that here, as little as in Germany, it is to a young man's detriment to have earned his degree "an einer kleinen Universität."

S.

Ohio, April 16, 1886.

Notes.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY of Maine is in process of completion by a member of the Maine Historical Society, Mr. Joseph Williamson, of Belfast. The titles already exceed 3,000.

Cupples, Upham & Co. will soon publish 'Fellow Travellers,' a New England story, by Mr. Edward Fuller, of the Boston *Daily Advertiser*; and 'Thoughts,' by Ivan Panin.

D. Appleton & Co. will publish during the present month a translation of Octave Feuillet's 'La Morte,' under the title, 'Aliette.'

The translation of Flaubert's 'Salammbô' just issued by Saxon & Co. is "Englished" (as he puts it) by M. French Sheldon, authorized by the heirs of M. Flaubert, and introduced by a dozen readable pages from the pen of Mr. Edward King. It is painful to find ourselves more fastidious than a man's heirs in behalf of his posthumous fame, but *we* could not willingly have authorized this translation. It is no worse than almost every other similar work of the present day; but it is no better. Example: "Il [Hamilcar] ajouta: 'Sois mon fils et défends ton père!' Narr' Havas eut un grand geste de surprise, puis se jeta sur ses mains, qu'il couvrit de baisers"—"Narr' Havas made a gesture of great surprise, afterwards, *throwing himself before Salammbô*, covered *her* hands with kisses." Mistakes similar to this, and also additions and omissions, abound throughout. M. French Sheldon describes Hamilcar as having a "most erudite and most personal" disdain of death. Flaubert conceived this disdain as "plus savant et plus intime" (more assured and more profound). It would not be amiss if his translator had a "plus savant et plus intime," as well as a "most erudite and most personal," knowledge of language before undertaking to cope with the exquisite subtleties of Flaubert's admirably perfected and marvellous style.

George Meredith's 'The Adventures of Harry Richmond' is the latest volume in the series of uniform reprints of this author's works which Roberts Bros. control for this country.

A new (the fourth) edition of Judge Nathaniel Holmes's 'Authorship of Shakspere' has just been brought out by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. in two volumes. The lapse of more than a decade has failed to shake the author's belief in Bacon's title to the plays; and to his Appendix he now adds a Supplement of 120 pages, for which Mrs. Henry Pott, by the publication of her 'Promus,' is chiefly responsible. He also furnishes a general index, so that in all respects the work is better of its kind than it was before.

The same firm send us the new edition of their 'Satchel Guide for the Vacation Tourist in Europe.' We notice a slight extension of the Addenda, and conclude that other changes have not been material.

Dodd, Mead & Co. send out two more pretty volumes of "Tales from Many Sources," viz., v. and vi. They include Mrs. Ewing's 'Lob Lie-by-the-Fire,' Mrs. Forrester's 'Virginia,' A. Mary F. Robinson's 'Goneril,' Mary Frances Peard's 'Number 7639'; 'Gracie,' by Lady Lindsay of Balcarres, E. C. Grenville Murray's 'Fleur de Lys,' E. C. Pointer's 'Emilia,' Hugh Conway's 'My First Client,' and 'How Quedglington was Sent Down,' by J. Stanley, besides four anonymous tales from *Temple Bar* and one from *Belgravia*.

One can but protest against the abuse of terms when the author of the 'Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family' styles her "studies from the lives of Livingstone, Gordon, and Patteson" 'Three *Martyrs* of the Nineteenth Century' (Dodd, Mead & Co.). None of these men can be properly designated a martyr, unless in the sense of one who spared not himself in the service to which he was devoted—as Livingstone might be called a martyr to science. Mrs. Charles calls Bishop Patteson's death at the hands of the outraged Melanesians "to them a sacrifice of expiation, to us a willing sacrifice of love"; but the fact that he was slain in retaliation for kidnapping done by others, has no more to do with martyrdom than would his upsetting in the surf at the time he was actually shot. As for Chinese Gordon, we leave Mrs. Charles to discuss his life and death and degree of Christian sanctity with Count Tolstoi.

The new volume, 'On Compromise,' in the uniform edition of John Morley's works (Macmillan), comes to American readers with a natural sound in its very title. Such of us as glance at the introduction will perceive what use Mr. Morley makes of the American example in national character, and particularly in national achievement, when we closed the disgraceful age of compromise with the civil war. These essays are now more than ten years old, but have still a practical value for every-day life.

The increasing host of genealogical investigators is indebted to Mr. Daniel S. Durrie for a third

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

edition, revised and enlarged, of his 'Alphabetical Index to American Genealogies and Pedigrees Contained in State, County, Town Histories, Printed Genealogies, and Kindred Works' (Albany: Joel Munsell's Sons). Mr. Durrie estimates that he now furnishes 20,000 references. This work, Mr. W. H. Whitmore's 'American Genealogist,' and Savage's 'Genealogical Dictionary' are the necessary outfit of any pedigree hunter.

The first series of 'Hans Andersen's Fairy Tales,' edited for school and home use by Miss J. H. Stickney, has been issued by Ginn & Co. The text has been minutely derived from several extant English versions, and the tales have been graded for progressive reading. The illustrations are the first made sixty years ago.

One of the most interesting and useful of the later practical books for daily living is a group of six lectures on 'School Hygiene,' delivered under the auspices of the Massachusetts Emergency and Hygiene Association to teachers and normal pupils (Boston: Ginn & Co.). There should be no geographical limit to such teaching, no class lines for those taught. It should be as attractive and it is as valuable in Illinois and Tennessee as in New England; and all persons who have reached years of discretion, whether formal teachers or not, will be the better off for what is here laid down in untechnical phrase about ventilation, drainage, the care of the eyes and of the nervous system, and similar topics. It brings the millennium nearer to thus preach the gospel of health to the poor—poor in the knowledge of life.

'The Science of Dress,' by Ada S. Ballin (London: Sampson Low & Co.), primarily written for English women and English ways, is wholesome truth for all civilized people. Happily for them, the uncivilized are rarely trammelled by dress. Miss Ballin writes wisely of the hygiene of infancy, and in the matter of women's dress advocates not revolution, but literal reform. Physiologically and æsthetically her suggestions for clothing, from babyhood to age, are rational and attractive; and sceptics as to possible improvements in female costume without sacrificing the charm of outline, will be agreeably disappointed. There is nothing bold, nothing offensive, and much that is healthful and comfortable, in her designs for the under and outer garments; and this we say advisedly, with the concurrence of a competent jury of experience and taste.

Dr. Coan's 'Ounces of Prevention' belongs to Harper's Handy Series, and is a reprinted conglomerate of odds and ends of sound sense and good physiology. The only exception we are disposed to make is to its estimate of beer as "an ideal drink." Beer is fattening, it is true, and in the essay on leanness it is commended for "the fair thin reader" desiring plumpness. But we will have none of it: our Venus is not born of the foam of the beer cask.

Mr. J. Pickering Putnam's 'Principles of House Drainage' (Boston: Ticknor & Co.) is an intelligent exposition of its subject; but the special praise that it bestows upon various agencies to that end, all bearing the same trade-name, opens the question of interest.

Dr. A. Riant, who had before written a number of practical works on hygiene, has just published a book which will be of interest to all whose duties make it necessary for them to exert the voice, 'Hygiène de l'orateur' (Paris: Baillière; Boston: Schoenhof). The author gives the broadest sense to the word orator, so that his suggestions will be found useful to the lawyer, the lecturer, the preacher, and the teacher. He treats, always from a medical point of view, of the voice, breathing, intonation, attitude, and gesture. He gives excellent advice as to what it is best for the speaker to do before, after, and while speaking, so as to insure the least amount of physical exhaustion. The book is written in a simple, straightforward style, and throughout the writer shows the skill of a specialist who has had personal experience in public speaking.

General Klapka, after Görgey the most eminent Magyar commander in the Hungarian war of 1848-9—we say Magyar in order not to place him above his Polish fellow-commander in the same struggle, General Bem—has added a large volume of 'Recollections' ('Emlékeimböl,' Buda-Pesth, 1886) to his long ago published writings on his military career ('Memoiren,' 1850, which also appeared in an English translation, and 'Der Nationalkrieg in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen,' 2 vols., 1851). The new work, however, covers a wider ground, containing also reminiscences of his earlier life, and devoting half of its space to six years of exile spent in Germany, England, France, Switzerland, and Turkey (1849-55). This exile, which began on the morrow of the capitulation of Comorn—Klapka's sally from which in August, 1849, ranks among the most famous exploits in Hungarian history—terminated with the restoration of the constitutional freedom of Hungary in 1867, when the returned soldier was elected a member of the National Diet. A continuation of the interesting narrative is promised with some reserve, and its translation from Magyar into German is anticipated.

Under the title 'Tagebuch über Martin Luther geführt von Dr. Conrad Cordatus,' Dr. H. Wrampelmeyer has edited for the first time a manuscript containing the earliest and fullest collection of the table talks of Luther. Cordatus, the collector, was a prominent figure in the Reformation, and enjoyed the most friendly relations with the great reformer. The notes were taken by him from Luther's lips, and as far as possible Luther's own words are reported in the 'Tagebuch.' The period covered by the journal is from 1524 to 1537, the larger part apparently relating to the years 1531 to 1533. From Cordatus's testimony it appears that others were engaged at the same time in taking notes of Luther's talks, but he says, "Nunc nemo nos imitatur." The work of only one of the persons thus alluded to by Cordatus, that by Dietrich Veit, is known, and it still remains inedited. Antonius Lauterbach took up the task in 1538, but did not go beyond that year. The extant Latin and German collections, although probably based upon Cordatus, Lauterbach, and Veit, show wide diversions from the original. There are many interpolations and revisions which affect the integrity of the text. In the 'Tagebuch' of Cordatus we have the most authentic and faithful record of Luther's familiar conversations, and a means for an intimate knowledge of the reformer not hitherto accessible in print.

The fifth volume of the 'Sammlung Englischer Denkmäler' has lately been published. It consists of the text of the English version of 'Flor and Blancheflor,' edited by Emil Hausknecht, with a preliminary study of the literary history of the tale, its origin and dissemination through the countries of Europe, and the numerous forms in which it is found in different literatures. The English poem was first produced by Hartshorn in his 'Ancient Metrical Tales,' from the Auchinleck MS.: a revised edition of this text was edited in 1857 by Laing for the Abbotsford Club. The Early English Text Society issued in 1866, under the editorship of J. Rawson Lumsby, two other versions of the poem taken from imperfect manuscripts. In none of these publications does the poem appear in any completeness. The present editor has been able to reproduce a much more complete text from a manuscript in the possession of the Marquis of Sutherland, which was inaccessible to previous editors.

Of the books published during 1885 in Iceland's little capital, the most notable, in more than one respect, is Mr. Eiríkur Magnússon's edition of Shakspere's "Tempest." It is in two daintily printed volumes, the first containing the editor's excellent Icelandic metrical version of the play, under the title of "Stormurinn," to which is prefixed a well-engraved facsimile of Droeshout's portrait and a life of the dramatist. The second volume comprises the English text from the Cambridge edition, followed by very complete historical, critical, and philological notes in Icelandic. Mr. Magnússon has been connected for many years with the University Library, Cambridge, and his annotations, as might be expected, are based upon the newest results of Shaksperian study. Outside, perhaps, of German, we know of no foreign language which possesses either so good an edition or so good a rendering of one of Shakspere's productions. Icelandic translations of "Hamlet," "Macbeth," and "Othello," by Mr. Matthías Jochumsson, and of "King Lear," by Mr. Steingrímur Thorsteinsson, have previously appeared.

We hope the term "Polandism," which in the last few days has repeatedly occurred in the foreign despatches to the daily newspapers, will speedily be dropped and buried in oblivion. It was perhaps an intended correction of the equally incorrect but on its face less absurd Pol*a*nism, which more than once preceded it in the telegrams referring to Bismarck's utterances on the nationality strife between Poles and Germans, and which, in its turn, was an accidental telegraphic corruption of the legitimate word Polonism (Ger. *der Polonismus*, from the mediæval Latin *Polonus*, Pole or Polish), which that statesman now so frequently uses. Polanism is as incorrect as would be Teutanism, and Polandism as barbarous a formation as would be Spainism or Belgiumism.

— The third volume of the 'Archives of Maryland,' edited and published with such scrupulous care by the Maryland Historical Society, has been for some time on our table. It consists of the Proceedings of the Council from 1636 to 1667, preceded by the charter and other documents illustrative of the first settlement of the colony, derived from foreign sources. This Council was partly what we now understand by the term in its relations to the Governor, and also had legislative functions as an Upper House, both in concurrence with the Assembly and independently; finally, it was the Provincial Court. In the present volume only its executive and administrative acts have been gathered together, and these naturally have more attraction for the historical student than for the antiquarian. There are great numbers of orders, commissions, and oaths, conditions of plantation, forms of submission, denizations, etc. The troubles of this period were not from the negroes but from the Indians, particularly those of the Eastern Shore, whose shooting of cattle and hogs, and not seldom of white men, kept the Council and the military well occupied. The "seuerall vagabonds & Idle persons knowne by the name of Quakers" likewise in their way disturbed the peace, not only by presumptuously standing covered, but by refusing to subscribe the engagement, "alleadging they were to be governed by Gods lawe and the light within them & not by mans lawe"; moreover, "diswading the People from Complying with the Military discipline in this time of Danger [1659] as also from giving testimony or being Jurors in causes depending between party & party or bearing any office in the Province." Nothing could be done with them except (after wearying of the cost of their detention in prison) to banish them, and on their return to whip them out again "from Constable to Constable." Some attention had to be paid, too, to Capt.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thomas Cornwallis, "a great Agent and factor for the setlinge of a Popish faction in Mary-Land" (1646). But no single person caused anything like the annoyance of the rebellious Capt. William Claiborne, concerning whom there are documents in plenty, and a curious inventory of effects seized "within Palmer's Island," including "1 hominie sifter," "a worme," "a combe-brush," etc.

—There are other social glimpses. The question of Mr. Thomas Gerrard's exact condition on a certain occasion in 1656 was met by Mr. Henry Coursey's oath "that the said Gerrard had drunke somthing extraordinary, but was not so much in drinke but he could gett out of a Carts way, & further saith not." John Dandy, for crimes committed, was, among other penalties, adjudged to be "publique Executioner within this Prouince," but by good behavior was in 1647 released from this unpleasant duty. The Commissioners appointed on the erection of Somerset Co. in 1668 were charged, *inter alia*, to inquire "of all manner of fellonies, Whitchcrafts inchantments Sorceryes Magick Arts," etc.; and quite the most picturesque and pathetic scene discernible in these musty records is that of the searching of Mary Lee, "a witch," on the *Charity*, during the voyage from London to Maryland in 1654 (as "the Ship grew daily more Leaky almost to desperation"); the finding of "Some Signall or Marke of a witch upon her" by two seamen who had "apprehended her without order"; its confirmation by "Mr. Chipsham and this Deponent"; the poor creature's being made fast by them "to the Capstall betwixt decks, And in the Morning the Signall was Shrunk into her body for the Most part"; finally, the "laying all their hands in generall to the Execution of her" by hanging—all, save the captain, who shut himself up in his cabin. Lighter matter for the curious is found in the declaration of the agents of the New Netherlands in 1659: "And here is to be noted that they deeply mistake themselues who interprett the Generall name of Manhattans aforesaid, vnto the particular Towne built vpon a little Jland because as it is said it signified the wholl Countrey & province, or at least that particular place in that province as per Example, like it is frequent still to this Day amongst some to Say to goe or Come from the Manhattans when they meane the whole province like vnto Virginia or Maryland for that particular Towne it selfe is never named the Manhattans, but New Amsterdam." Finally, we remark the extraordinary number of spellings in which the name of the Susquehanna tribe was recorded; the most elaborate, perhaps, being Sasquisahanoughes.

—The London correspondent of the *Tribune*, writing in regard to the late Henry Stevens, is puzzled by his title "Citizen of Noviomagus." "After some reflection," he speaks of the strange name as applied both to certain geographical localities and to a club of antiquaries to which Stevens belonged. The members of that club can hardly be called antiquaries, as will be seen by an account of that association derived from Stevens himself. Sixty years ago a few hail fellows well met in London naturally gravitated together. They wished to meet socially and convivially, and yet could not afford, or desired to shun, the heavy charges prevalent in other clubs. For this end they decided to have no club-room, but to meet for a monthly dinner at some inexpensive hotel. They observed that geographers were quite agreed in identifying all old Roman stations about London save one—namely, Noviomagus. This place, set down in the Antonine Itinerary as ten miles out from London, but in an undetermined direction, had been, and was still, a bone of antiquarian contention. Now, though the monthly dinners were gander-parties, the fraternity had resolved on an annual rusticating excursion, enlivened by the presence of their wives and daughters. This outing they decided to call a search for the long-lost Noviomagus. Year by year some new suburban retreat has been discovered and enjoyed, but the site of Noviomagus, after three score years, still lies undetected. One of the last dinners at which Mr. Stevens was able to be present, in November, 1884, was eaten at the Freemasons' Tavern. Among the members were A. H. Bullen, head of the British Museum Library, ex-Lord Mayor Holt, the editor of the *Athenæum*, etc. One member gave an account of a tour in Ireland, and a few impromptu speeches were called for, but the leading feature was free-and-easy talk. The oddest characteristic of the association was a Babel-like confusion of tongues. Each member is bound to say just the opposite of what he means, and to offer an insult when he means a compliment. Each one, too, interpreted like *Petruchio*, who, when *Kate* was mute, commended her volubility, and, when she railed, told her she sang as sweetly as a nightingale. Such a knot of humorists was after Stevens's heart, and he was the soul of their good-fellowship.

— The March number of *Les Lettres et les Arts* (Paris: Boussod, Valadon et Cie.; Boston: Schoenhof) seems at the first glance less brilliant than its predecessors, but upon examination it proves to be not inferior to them. There could not be anything more perfect in simplicity and beauty of arrangement and detail than the "Pêche aux Alouettes" of M. Fernand Calmettes, to which he has added such charming illustrations: nothing more delicately pathetic than "Le Manuscrit d'un Médecin de village" of M. Anatole France; nothing more sparkling and gay than "Le Divan rouge" of M. Francisque Sarcey, a long chapter of personal recollections told in his most delightful manner, and giving promise that more may be expected in the future. M. Adolphe Racot has an interesting seventeenth-century sketch, "Le Duel de Chapelain," of which the principal illustration is a fine full-page reproduction of the "Bretteur" of Meissonier. The expressive portrait, by Toulmouche, of Mme. Rose Caron, the lyric artist, is accompanied by a few pages from the musician, M. Ernest Reyer, the friend of the painter and the impressario of the singer, in which the *Revue* has obtained its usual excellent results from the choice of a peculiarly suitable person who is not a writer by profession. The most beautifully illustrated article in the number is the short one by M. Gerspach, "Note sur les Tapisseries de Baudry," in which the three of this artist's designs which escaped destruction when the Musée of the Gobelins was burned in 1872, are reproduced. On the completion of the first quarterly volume by the publication of this number, the direction of the *Revue* passed from the hands of M. Anatole France into those of M. Frédéric Masson, who contributed to the earlier numbers the interesting articles upon "Le Déisme pendant la Révolution."

—Prof. Alessandro D'Ancona, who has conspicuously maintained that Dante's Beatrice was identical with Beatrice Portinari, has lately been gratified with a letter from Prof. Adolfo Bartoli, who has hitherto doubted the flesh-and-blood reality of the mistress of Alighieri. Bartoli communicates the fact that among the *codici* of the Ashburnham Collection is one which contains a commentary on the 'Divine Comedy,' by Pietro, the son of Dante. The preface expressly declares this authorship and relationship, and the Commentary is evidently by the same hand that composed the Commentary already printed and ascribed to Pietro. The differences in the two texts, however, are such as to imply a complete working over at a date later than that of the printed one (1340)—say from 1343 to 1360. Apart from confirming the authorship of the earlier, which has been disputed, the revised Commentary contains this passage in the second chapter of the "Inferno," upon the first mention of Beatrice:

"Et quomodo hic primo de Beatrice fit mentio, de qua tantus est sermo maxime infra in tertio libro paradisi, premittendum est quod revera quidam domina nomine Beatrix insignis valde moribus et pulcretudine tempore auctoris viguit in civitate florentie, nata de domo quorundam civium florentinorum qui dicuntur portinarii, de qua dantes auctor procus fuit et amator in vita dicte domine, et in ejus laudem multas fecit cantilenas: qua mortua ut euis nomen in famam levaret, in hoc suo poemate sub allegoria et typo theologie eam ut plurimum accipere voluit."

The curious will find Bartoli's creditably magnanimous letter published in the Florence *Nazione* of April 2.

ANOTHER DIARIST.—I.

Remarks and Collections by Thomas Hearne. Edited by C. E. Doble, Master of Worcester College, Oxford: for the Oxford Historical Society. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1885.

THE never-to-be-glutted appetite of our race for gossip (even for gossip without the spice of scandal) makes sure that whoever has or can get diaries, journals, biographies, autobiographies, correspondence, family records—pretty nearly anything about anybody, or of anybody about anything—into his hands, shall instantly sweep the horizon with his two eyes till he sees a publisher of good promise, and shall go to him, and, if need be, from him to another and another, until he can find for his material a way to the world of readers through the press. And beside this general craving for anything whatever that is fresh or seems fresh, there is that wide interest, ever waiting to be satisfied, in large unsettled questions; in historical characters, uncertain or suspected; in sudden turns of affairs never well explained. Then, too, there are those narrower but very many more interests in old neighborhood mysteries and feuds and jealousies and claims. In any case, the writers, or those written about, may have been third or fourth persons, or a little further off, from chief characters, and may have done the deeds, or may have got the credit for them. The writers may have been those who had all chance to know, and often a shrewd wit to understand or guess, what was going on or done around them. Then the number of those who have an antiquarian turn is large and growing, at least in proportion to the rest of us.

To be sure, sometimes, in spite of the general hunger of reading people, conscience or self-interest will come in between, and snatch the expected sheets out of the very press itself, away from the public; but the amount which finds a way through to the world is astonishing. To be sure, too, a great deal of this is but like the very poor and rude pottery, or flimsier than the slight filigree work, or clumsy as the clumsy tools, unearthed, with things of better worth, by tireless Dr. Schliemann's spades, or Prince Torlonia's. The public culls out from these the few things that it cares for, and waits for more. By a general consent, pretty well observed, bad things, out of a dead man's pockets or lockups, sure to hurt his fame and others' hearts; likely to do harm to many and good to none—such things, if they have fallen under honest and pitiful eyes, eyes that are wont to look up themselves for mercy, are thrust speedily back again and buried in a darker depth than that from which they came.

Some of these collections of gossip that, as we may suppose, are coming hereafter, whether

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about single men of note or communities, or the society of a certain time, or great warriors, or great transactions, will very likely become, what some have been before, lasting treasuries for many generations following. In which direction to look for the next, one can no more tell than whither to look for the next bubble in shallow standing water. In any direction there may be the eyes and ears busy and the hand taking its chance to write.

In the times of the Stuarts, and the Commonwealth, and the Stuarts again, and William and Mary, an English university, and, of the two universities, especially Oxford, was an object of very close oversight and very frequent interference by the Government of the country. This was because the university exercised an immense direct and indirect influence; it held great privileges, definite and indefinite; handled considerable incomes; and was swayed by men and represented by men, as heads of colleges and halls, who, in troublous times, by the bad habit existing, got and kept their places for political and ecclesiastical partisanship, not for learning, or goodness, or fitness to teach. Here, therefore, men who had every claim that in peaceful times would be strong against all attack, could not at all be sure of holding their own. So an English university, and especially Oxford University, was kept wakeful and astir, with some of its members angry and feeling bitterly aggrieved, with some fearful, and some untiring and ruthless in putting out and putting in, making complaints, following up, pamphlet-writing, and electioneering.

Oxford had been a favorite and trusted and favored place in the time of the unwise and unhappy Charles the First. He had held there negotiations for peace with his revolted subjects; had stayed there more than once and made it his headquarters, and had gathered there so much of the Parliament of the realm as would come to his call. The Commonwealth had harried (figuratively but pretty really) the University and the town. James the Second had cajoled and threatened the authorities and the electors, and done summary injustices, and wreaked sudden vengeances among them, to get rid of the men that he would not have there, and to get in the men that he wanted there. William of Orange had used something pretty much like the same process backwards, from the time that he took James's place. Indeed, the temptation was so strong and the habit had become so settled, that even in the quiet and "good" Queen Anne's time the same way was followed by those who had the power. The connection of the men of the University with churchmen and statesmen and politicians outside, everywhere, was of course very close, and communications were constant. Discussing and expressing of opinion were (and of course, too) incessant. A journal well kept at Oxford by a person of competent ability and opportunities, and not wanting in feeling, during the active supremacy of the Romish religion at court, or the swift revolution that followed, or the reign of the Reformed-Dutch husband of the English wife, or not long before or after, may be expected to furnish to students of history matter worth their reading, if they are great enough or little enough to think it worth their while to glean.

Thomas Hearne, from whose manuscript diaries we have here an opening volume printed, had given such promise in boyhood that a neighbor had taken to himself the cost of the boy's education. He had been entered in 1695 at Edmund Hall, Oxford, of which the eminent Doctor Mill was principal: had proceeded B.A., in 1699, graduating with excellent character and scholarship. He had then put aside much urgency that he should take holy orders, and come over as a missionary to Maryland. The urgency had been weighted (because he was known to be a bookish man) with an offer of "the general supervision of the libraries of that province." He had a strong bent to old books, and old ways, and other things old, and rather took an assistant-keepership, which offered, in the great Bodleian Library. Already he was forecasting an edition of Livy, and other books, and his help was already sought by several learned men in the editing of their own works. So here he planted himself, and here he stayed; a man whose principles, in religion and politics, were not dissembled, but, at the same time, were not flaunted in his neighbors' faces; nor were they flung under other people's feet to trip them up, or to be trampled upon. The editor gives us little account of Hearne, promising his life, by another hand, at the end of the series; but we know that he was an honest "non-juror"—a statement which, to those who understand and remember about the English Revolution of two hundred years ago, sufficiently expresses his faith and practice, as churchman and subject. We cannot think that much is to be told of him.

Here, in the great Oxford library, was a quiet, steadfast man, belonging to a small party, overmastered but not cowed, who was hearing, and seeing, and receiving letters, and who was also writing down. One hundred and eighty years away, our fancy easily figures him (in an allegorical way) a man with a grave face, bearing a light which he shelters or shades with his hand, and over which he peers. The first entry in his diary was in 1705, in the third year of Queen Anne. At that time three were still living of "the seven bishops" who, seventeen years before, with the prayers, and tears, and love, and reverence of all England—people, army, mob—had meekly accepted imprisonment in the Tower and whatever was to follow under threats of relentless vengeance from the stupid bigot and despot who was then doing his best and worst to keep a throne. With all the rest, James had packed judges' benches and jury-boxes, till courts of justice were almost as sure as bludgeons and daggers, and they had maddened him by an effort, more than humble, to save him from dragging down, by reckless breaking of law, his own overhanging fate, and the ruin of their country. And yet, shortly after, when James had run off, with his claim to govern the nation to please himself, and the bulk of the nation was resolved that he should never come back with his claim, five of these bishops, with others of their order, and some hundreds of priests—some of them the choicest of the men who had knelt and bared cheek and back to buffet and scourge, that they might protest against lawless tyranny—refused to take the oaths to a revolutionary government, though better, beyond all comparison. To these non-jurors was clinging a considerable, though not large, body of laymen; among them, of course, our Hearne.

In the space of half a generation, which had now gone by, few had come to this party; some of its members had changed their minds about obedience to the Government after it was well settled, and many had gone forever to a land where there are no revolutions and no questions of governments, in fact or by right. A communion which had been set up separate from the Church of England "as by law established," and identical with it in structure, and doctrine, and worship, was going down, although it had secured a succession of bishops of its own. At the same time, prosecutions and persecutions had gone on, animosities had not yet died out of private life, and, of course, were often bitter; and books, as thick as November meteors, had been gleaming and going out in the air.

The editor and others think that the chief value of these diaries of Hearne will be found in the facts and side-lights which they furnish for the history of the Non-jurors, of whom a good many people in England and some in this country are not yet tired. Certainly there was little coming, or going, or stirring, or doing, or undoing, within reach of his sight or hearing, that he has not noted, so far as it interested or concerned him. Some things, of course, he saw and heard, and meddled not with. Some things, too, outside of his own line, he notes. Thus he mentions a clock referred to in Selden's manuscripts, "the motions of whose wheeles were not to be finished in an C years, no, not in a thousand, nay perpetual; an instrument made by Janollus Turianus Cremonensis and presented to the Emperor Charles the 1st, of which there is made some mention lib. 17, Cardani de subtilitate." From the same manuscripts he gives, in the Latin, a paragraph "De Influentiis Cœlestibus" (quere, electricity? galvanism? magnetism?), in which paragraphs from Selden we find matter enough (pretty nearly) for a claim in advance of these Pan-Electric Telephone people, who, with the Attorney-General of the United States among them, are contesting patent-rights. After saying that it was by help of these (influences), "beyond doubt, that Roger Bacon put speech into the brazen horsehead" (and we have all heard that), the Latin paragraph tells us: "and, as I have heard from certain credible persons, Doctor Godwin, now [1616—1633] Bishop of Hereford, has very excellent skill in that art, and has, many times, made a horse's head talk; they say, too, that he has written a treatise on that subject, as, also, *of the way of sending a message a very long distance in a very short time* (de modo mittendi nuntium per longissimam viam brevissimo tempore). These are all done by influences." If that does not touch Morse's credit, it looks as if, in skilful hands, it might be made to strike the Attorney-General and his associates about as heavily as they can hit Mr. Bell.

SCHERER'S HISTORY OF GERMAN LITERATURE.

Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur. Von Wilhelm Scherer. Dritte Ausgabe. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1885.

A History of German Literature. By W. Scherer. Translated from the third German edition by Mrs. F. C. Conybeare. Edited by F. Max Müller. Two volumes. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1886.

It is needless to say that there has been no satisfactory history of German literature. Many of the older works were heavy and pedantic in character, with the bibliographical element the leading feature; others, like the ponderous work of Gervinus, have been confined to the poets, while others have been diffuse treatises like that of Kurz, or confined to the writings of a particular period, like the works of Julian Schmidt. Few men in Germany are equally fitted with Professor Scherer to undertake a history of German literature. Joined to a knowledge which is ample, he is master of a style which for clearness and beauty has been seldom employed in the service of the history of literature, at least in Germany. He has purposed to give one clear, collected view of the whole field of German literature, and has sought to emphasize the significance of the great names which have given an impulse to the spiritual life of the nation. His work, therefore, represents periods and influences, and is not a mere catalogue of writers with a description of their works—a museum in which each specimen has its pin and its card, and is of equal importance. Hence the biographical element is not prominent. The au-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thor does not aim to carry his history beyond the death of Goethe (1832). He necessarily outlines the earlier character of Heine's work and suggests its later direction, but beyond the place of his birth we cannot from this history tell where he lived or what was his profession.

The following is a good example of his aptness in catching the most picturesque views, which stimulate the imagination and impress vital facts upon the memory:

"Choral songs played an important part on all the great occasions of private and public life. Choral songs received the wedded bride, and conducted her to her husband. The praises of the dead were celebrated in a solemn funeral chorus. The march into battle and the sacrificial procession were attended with choral song. The departure for battle was itself a kind of sacred procession, when all who took part in it sang the praises of a saving god, Donar (Thunor), the slayer of monsters. Their loud battle-cry, which they called *barditus*, was supposed to be an imitation of thunder, the 'beard speech' of the god. They also sang the deeds of their ancestors, and drew courage from the example of their forefathers. Little is told us about the sacrifice itself, but remnants of heathen worship lingered on for a long time, and with them some poor fragments of songs. Thus, for example, in Mecklenburg, the reapers leave a few ears of corn uncut; these they tie together, besprinkle them, form a circle round them, and, taking off their hats, call on Wodan—

"'Wode, Wode, now fetch thy horse food, now thistle and thorn,
In a year's time corn.'"

The history abounds in rapid and graphic summaries like the following:

"The migration of nations begins with the Goths, with the Goths heroic song, with the Goths Christianization. The Goths are the most advanced nation of the ancient Germans; they are like a gifted man who consumes his powers in too intense aspiration, who dies young in the midst of a brilliant career. Such tragic forms have seldom lived in vain. Their fantastic greatness, their bold resolution, is an example and a precursor: it teaches through mistakes the better way. . . . Indeed, the problems which were allotted to the Goths occupy the Middle Age and modern times; they return again and again in all of German history: empire, popular religious training, toleration of other nationalities and faiths. While heroic song begins with the East Goths, Christianization begins with the West."

In discussing the 'Nibelungenlied,' the author, as is well known, adopts the views of Lachmann. He holds that but few of the songs could have proceeded from one author, and that the poet is undiscoverable. Even if we accept the hypothesis of a single author, we know that he derived his material from popular songs, and a careful estimate of the inequalities and contradictions in his poems shows that his poetic power was not sufficient to harmonize the discrepancies. "Possibly a final revision of the songs did not take place. Instead of speaking of one poet, we can only speak of him who first committed them to writing." In his view, joined to noble passages are barren wastes, and silly, ridiculous, and tedious passages, making the 'Lied' far inferior to the 'Iliad' in sustained power and beauty. Professor Scherer's power is admirably exhibited in the analysis of the plot and action of the middle High-German epics. These are full of graceful interpretative passages, the product of wide reading and skilful generalization.

Of all the historians of German literature, the rugged Gervinus remains a mine of wealth, and the influence of his opinions is manifest in some of the coloring of this volume. In the discussion of Kant and the period of the *Aufklärung*, we think that we can discover traces of Julian Schmidt, as in the whole treatment of the philosophy of the time. We do not mean that Prof. Scherer's views are based upon those of any individual for his judgment is singularly independent and characteristic, even when his opinions accord with those of others. The few pages devoted to Luther give not only a vivid picture of his personality and an admirable condensed estimate of his writings, but measure the circle of his activity and the forces that he evoked and swayed in the Reformation. Lessing's treatment is not quite satisfactory. His 'Education of the Human Race' and his 'Dialogues on Freemasonry' are barely mentioned. The analysis of 'Nathan the Wise' is inadequate, and so, in general, is the whole presentation of Lessing as a dramatist.

There are literary judgments which vary from the accepted verdict. Thus, in speaking of Wilhelm Schlegel's translation of Shakspere, he says: "Schlegel's Shakspere certainly surpassed Voss's Homer. It did not conceal the wide difference between creative and imitative art, but it showed the close kinship between one perfect work and another, and for this reason it may rank directly by the side of the works which Goethe and Schiller produced in the period of their common labors." The pertinence of this last comparison is doubtful, but it is instructive to cite Gervinus's view: "With the exception of Luther's Bible, there is no translated work in any language or literature that can be compared with Voss's Homer; in our literature there is no work that has revealed such a treasure of language and poetry." Again, while Scherer's investigations in the life and works of Goethe have given him eminence among Goethe scholars, and he writes with enthusiasm and a fulness of detail upon his favorite subject, his criticisms are frank and of a quite different order from those of many of the Goethe cult. Thus, he says of 'Wilhelm Meister's Wanderjahre':

"The whole seems rather a collection of materials for a book than a complete work. Much about which the reader would like to be informed remains obscure. Strange and off-hand assumptions are made without the slightest hesitation; a wealth of practical experience and wisdom drawn from nature and history is spread out before us, but the narrative sometimes comes to a standstill, and the chief charm of the book lies in the episodical novelettes."

Of 'Faust' he says: "The whole plan was not carried out. Important scenes which Goethe had had in view are wanting, and unevennesses were not smoothed away. It is when taken as a whole, and seen, so to speak, from a distance, that the poem discloses the same unity as the Homeric epics or the 'Nibelungenlied' or 'Gudrun'." This is not a very strong assertion, as Professor Scherer claims that these epics are by various authors. He proceeds:

"The period of sixty years over which the work was extended, the frequent interruptions to which it was subjected, and the variety of moods under which it was written, have prevented 'Faust' from attaining any closer unity than this. In most of the first part we admire the sure, bold hand of the young or mature artist; in the second part, along with marvellously effective scenes, we find weaker portions, in which the hand of the now aged master seems to tremble. . . . There is, however, a good deal of spurious symbolism in the second part, which Goethe should not have allowed himself—I refer to utterances which would be appropriate if they came from Goethe's own lips, but which are little consonant with the characters in whose mouths he puts them, and in which he either remains obscure or offends if his meaning is understood."

We cannot forbear to quote Scherer's estimate of Heine's "Reisebilder," which, though apparently unstudied, touches much of the weakness of this poet, so fascinating in spite of his caprice:

"In this book the genuine descriptions of scenery, and above all the North Sea pictures, sometimes reveal a real power of observation and expression, at other times a grotesque mythologizing fancy. In the rest of the book, however, and particularly in the much-admired section on Italy, we have not much more than an imitation of Sterne's 'Sentimental Journey.' There is the same cobweb of individualism spun over external objects, the same political gossip of the emptiest nature, along with a poetic conception of the world almost as meagre as Klopstock's, and reiterated till we are tired of it. The real is tricked out with or supplanted by the unreal; lifeless things are represented as animated, living things imagined as dead, while dreams and reality are indistinguishably mingled; the poet and nature reflect each other; a spirit of melancholy pervades all things, and is revealed particularly in black eyes. These flowers have no fragrance for us; they are, as it were, faded after a night of revelry. The filth alone, of which there is enough in the 'Pictures of Travel,' is as filthy as ever it was. What a contrast have we in this book of Heine's with the calm, pure outlook maintained by Goethe as he journeyed through Italy!"

The chapters upon the Romantic School and Science are worthy of especial mention. The concluding paragraph upon German character and the future intellectual growth of the nation is as truthful as it is discerning:

"Goethe's 'Faust' contains a deep moral lesson for the German nation in particular. It expressed a longing for action in an age which was poor in deeds. Many writers of the time echo this spirit; for example, we find the Baron vom Stein continually deploring the predominance in Germany of metaphysics and speculative science. The Germans, he wrote, owing to their exclusion from public affairs, had lost all power of initiative and had taken to idle broodings. And in fact, since the Reformation, the German character had become more and more introspective, and modern German poetry has but seldom glorified the strong, indomitable will which belongs to men of action. . . . If in 1800 the nation was over-intellectual, it now begins to be over-material, and threatens to fall under the sway of those tendencies which beset the German world of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, to the prejudice both of its culture and character.

"A survey of all the successive epochs of German literary history will alone serve to reveal to us the latent capacities of the nation, in the harmonious development of all of which lies its real perfection. This perfection may be attained if the fatal onesidedness which so easily lays hold of the German character, can be overcome; or if men will restrain their natural inclinations by conscious labor, and so carry over into the present and future the spirit of the age which is expiring. Many Germans of to-day need no spurring in order to take to the life of generally useful activity which Faust only embraces after going often astray; everything now seems in favor of these practical men. Meanwhile those who live after Goethe's example, and look on poetry as a sacred and national task, have to struggle against wind and weather and to work doubly hard. Let them, too, find encouragement in the words which the angels sing as they bear aloft the soul of Faust:

"'Wer immer strebend sich bemüht,
Den können wir erlösen.'"

The volumes are accompanied by an appendix, containing notes and authorities, which must be a guide of high value to the student of German literature. In addition to a full and very satisfactory index there is a chronological table of German literary history. We note as omissions in the chronology, under the year 1803, the deaths of Herder, Gleim, and Heinse. Of the English edition it should be said that Prof. Max Müller's name is connected with it in a way likely to mislead as to his responsibility for it. Properly speaking he has none, and one will look in vain for any traces of his "editing." We believe his relations to Mrs. Conybeare and to the Clarendon Press were purely advisory and intermediary.

Remarks on the Administrative Forest Staff of Prussia, and the Training of its Officers. By D. Brandis, late Inspector-General of Indian Forests. Reprinted from the *Indian Forester*.

It is Dr. Brandis who organized and put into good working order the great Indian Forest Service, remaining at its head long enough to satisfy himself of its entire success in immensely increased forest revenues for the state and in the permanence of the Indian forests. The Indian Forest Service is, on the whole, in view of the natural difficulties which had to be overcome in its establishment, the vastness and variety of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

territory to be operated in, and the shortness of the time which has elapsed since the movement for the preservation of the Indian forests began, one of the most successful pieces of scientific administrative work we can recall. Dr. Brandis, who has now left India and the Indian service, describes, for the benefit of his old Indian associates, in the pamphlet the title of which is given above, the Prussian system of training foresters.

Americans, accustomed to dealing with large figures, will be struck with the small extent of the Prussian State forests upon which so much care and attention has been bestowed. These cover but 6,597,000 acres—an area so small that we think nothing of cutting down or burning up nearly three times as much forest every year. These Prussian forests, however, although less profitable than those of France, produce annually an average of 5,374,000 loads of 50 cubic feet of timber and small wood, and net to the Government annually nearly five million dollars, or about one dollar and thirty-five cents per acre every year. When it is remembered that most of the forest lands which belonged to the United States were sold in fee for a dollar an acre, to say nothing of the tens of millions of acres which have been given away without an adequate return, or otherwise squandered, it will perhaps be apparent that scientific forest management is a good business operation for a nation to undertake. And even now, could the forests remaining on the public domain be made to pay an annual income equal to one-half or even one-quarter of that produced by the Prussian forests, the result would be simply astounding.

The subordinate staff of the Prussian State forests chiefly employed in their protection—that is, foresters and forest guards—numbers 3,783 persons, in addition to which there is an administrative staff of 807 persons, consisting of 8 high executive officers, with headquarters at Berlin, 122 forest inspectors, and 677 executive officers in charge of forest districts or ranges. This staff, besides the management of the State forests, has the general control of more than three million acres of other public forests, the property of various towns and villages, schools, hospitals, and different public associations. There are in Prussia, besides these public forests, nearly eleven million acres of private forests, the management of which is entirely free and unrestricted, except in certain exceptional cases where public welfare demands special treatment.

The first step for a candidate wishing to secure a position in the Administrative Forest Staff (in which about twenty-eight vacancies occur every year) is to obtain permission to serve a practical apprenticeship of one year in one of the State forest districts. The papers which the candidate must submit in order to obtain this permission include a medical certificate and the certificate of graduation from a large public school (gymnasium), from which he must have graduated with credit in mathematics. The candidate is expected during his apprenticeship to make himself familiar with his forest district and the details of forest working. He is employed in handling timber, in planting and sowing, and in other cultural details. He assists the executive and protective officers in the forest and in the office; he is taught the use of instruments, and takes part in surveying, levelling, and road-making. He is allowed to hunt and shoot, and so gradually becomes familiar with the woods. If he makes satisfactory progress during his first year, he is given a certificate which permits him to attend during two years more the lectures and practical exercises in one of the German Forest Schools.

There are eight of these schools in Germany. Two are in Prussia, one at Neustadt-Eberswalde, near Berlin, the other at Münden near Göttingen. Candidates for the Prussian service, however, are allowed to prosecute their studies in any of the great German schools. The courses in the Forest Schools embrace general forest economy, sylviculture, the systems of working plans, valuation of forests, forest literature, the art of hunting and shooting, the utilization of forest produce, forest protection, forest administration, the history of forestry, the measurement of timber, the subdivision of forests, road-making, and the peculiarities of forest trees. Frequent excursions, conducted by the officers of the school, are made into the great forests connected with all European Forest Schools. At the completion of the two years in the Forest School, another year must be devoted to hearing lectures on jurisprudence, political economy, and finance. Allowance must also be made for a year of military service, so that altogether five years are spent before a candidate is allowed to present himself for his first examination. This examination, for which a high standard is fixed, includes all branches of forestry, surveying, pure mathematics, statics and mechanics, selected branches of jurisprudence, botany, zoölogy, mineralogy, physics, and chemistry. Plans of a plot of land not less than 200 acres surveyed by the candidate, besides a forest map covering some 1,200 acres made by him, must also be submitted.

This examination being successfully passed, the candidate's next step is to pass two years in practical work in several forest districts. At the end of this period he comes up for his second examination, which is intended to test the fitness of the candidate for the management of forests and for forest administration generally. A man who has successfully passed this second examination is at last eligible for appointment in the State forest service. All the successful candidates do not, however, find State employment. A year ago no less than 147 of these passed candidates or Forest Assessors had failed to obtain permanent Government employment. The fact that young men are willing to work for years with only an uncertain prospect of Government employ at the end, more than anything else shows the esteem in which the German forest service is held, and the value of the education which it affords.

Dr. Brandis concludes this most interesting and instructive paper with a brief account of the organization of the Prussian Forest Administration, a description of the training of administrative forest officers in Bavaria, and a statement of the pay and allowances of German administrative forest officers. The length to which this notice has already extended prevents more than the mention of this fact. We in America are a long way from a system of forest management, either private or public, based upon a solid and comprehensive education like that possessed by the German foresters; and Dr. Brandis's remark that "forest work in India has been more of an administrative than of a professional character" will be equally true in the United States long after we can boast of anything like real forest work, if that time ever comes.

Letters to Dead Authors. By Andrew Lang. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1886.

THIS book is one of the luxuries of the literary taste. It is meant for the exquisite palate, and is prepared by one of the "knowing" kind. It is a surprise to find that these little essays were journalistic squibs; but half-a-dozen of the more refined of the entire twenty-two did not suffer the vulgarization of first seeing the light in the *St. James's Gazette*, and these six are as a group the best. Writing in this vein is a rare faculty, and most of the success depends upon the touch, light, deft, and changeable, of the subtly practised hand. It is an astonishing little volume, not so much for the dispersion of the immortals selected for correspondence, in country and age, as for the range of the subjects which are considered to be matters of interest to them. The cleverness lies in the modern turn of the letters, however ancient the address. Of course the chief and obvious topic of the literary celebrities of time past is their own precious selves and the fortune of their books and reputation; this is only human in them, and in this particular class of mortals it is human in a superlative degree. It is easy, therefore, for Mr. Lang to secure their attention—there never was a more honeyed flatterer of the literary *amour propre*—so long as he tells them how large the last editions are, and how much they ought to be thought of, if, in fact, his conscience compels him to suggest that there are still cavillers at them; and the skill and smiling pleasure with which he hastens to bedew their enemies' books with vitriol—such pestilent fellows, for example, as M. Fleury, M. Scherer, and Swinburne—would make any ghost of an author jump with exuberant joy.

But Mr. Lang has to keep an eye open on the peeping Tom of a public on whose curiosity he is really trading, and when the reputation of these dead worthies is of too ancient an odor he must put his brains to work. A curious questioner among the dead might have his suspicions aroused, as sometimes occurs among the living whose letters are "given to the press" before they are mailed, that he was being made a jack of. That expedition of the English into Nile Valley after Gordon was no doubt very entertaining to Sir John Mandeville, and the laugh at the Coquecigrues of the Salvation Army must have amused Rabelais, and so on; but Eusebius of Cæsarea at least must have guessed he was a literary convenience whereby his amiable young epistolary friend was airing his views before a whole academy of mythologists. None, however, has so much to complain of as Chapelain, who might justly consider such irony impertinent even in a private communication, let alone an open epistle; but Mr. Lang ought to be popular with most of the recipients when he steps on the other side. One fancies how the satirical dent in Poe's lip will dimple round the corner as he extends his hand and says, "True, sir; I was a gentleman among *canaille*"; and will take him off under his arm from the quiet group of Irving, Cooper, Hawthorne, Longfellow, and Emerson, and play him a new song on that instrument which he "fashioned from a woman's breast-bone," as Mr. Lang has elsewhere said. But from such company he will have the good sense to escape in the next world; and with Horace and Lucian and Ronsard and Molière, whose praises he sings so well in prose, he may forget the Stygian American.

We commend the book (which might well bear for its legend the idle line, "Where the bee sucks, there suck I") to all who prefer the dainty in literature with a tang of Scotch strength to whet the soon cloyed appetite of a Northern epicurean.

The Early Hanoverians. By Edward E. Morris, Professor of English in the University of Melbourne. [Epochs of Modern History.] With maps and plans. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1886.

MR. MORRIS, the original editor of the "Epochs" series, has prepared this volume to fill the gap between his own 'Age of Anne' and Mr. Longman's 'Frederick the Great.' It comprises the reign of George I. and that of George II. down to the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1748. In his preface, Mr. Morris reminds his readers of the cardinal principle of the series, "to make the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

division of history horizontal rather than vertical"—a principle which, it must be confessed, has been forgotten by the authors of some of the volumes. Accordingly, he has produced a good account, not merely of such familiar subjects as the Triple and Quadruple Alliance, the administration of Alberoni, the Pragmatic Sanction, and the War of the Austrian Succession—all of which touch English history closely—but of those more remote events, the Turkish wars and the War of the Polish Succession. The history of Peter the Great, which falls in this period, is omitted, having been fully treated in 'The Age of Anne.'

Mean as was the English nation and government during these years, there are many events of even romantic interest, and the reader will be grateful for the full exposition of Law's scheme, the South Sea Bubble, the Porteous riots, and Anson's famous but little known voyages of discovery. The rebellion of 1745 is the subject of a long and interesting chapter. Mr. Morris is strong in the delineation of character, and the comparison he draws between the two Pretenders (p. 147) is one of the best things in this line. "Probably neither," he says, "was deficient in personal courage, but the father lacked resolution, and had, except with reference to his own claims, a vacillating mind as well as a melancholy disposition; whereas the son showed the dashing bravery of a true Highlander, happier in attack than in defence, and had an elastic gayety of spirit, ever brighter when clouds were darkest. . . . If we seek for an explanation of the difference between them, perhaps we may find it in the Sobieski descent of the younger. It is important to notice this strain in him."

An interesting paragraph (p. 142) describes the conduct of the Irish brigade which decided the day at Fontenoy, and ends with the words of George II., "Cursed be the laws which deprive me of such subjects." But, to our surprise, we find no statement of these laws, and no other allusion to the English rule in Ireland during this period. This seems a strange omission. The Battle of the Boyne was a well-won victory, and established a dynasty in Ireland. This was the fortune of war. But the repressive and intolerant legislation which followed had no justification, and is one of the deepest stains upon English history. It was this that George meant when he cursed the laws that gave his enemies the assistance of the Irish brigade, and it ought, it would seem, to have received some notice in this volume.

The history of literature during the period under review is very full and good—that is, the literature of England and France, for no other nation had a literature that need be considered in a book of this size. The victory of Dettingen gives occasion to mention the Dettingen Te Deum; but music is otherwise neglected, although the age of Bach and Handel deserves for this reason, and this alone, to rank as a great creative epoch in art. Like all the volumes of the series, the present contains a number of excellent maps and plans, nine in number; also three genealogical tables.

Protestants from France, in their English Home. By S. W. Kershaw. With illustrations. London: S. Low. 1885. Pp. xii, 170. 8vo.

IN this book Mr. Kershaw gathers together the principal historical data in regard to the various Huguenot congregations in Great Britain, and their connection with the Church of England. His position as librarian at Lambeth Palace has given him peculiar facilities for prosecuting his researches in this direction, and the numerous facts and extracts from the correspondence of the bishops and statesmen of the seventeenth century, in some cases from unpublished manuscripts, show that he has gleaned over a wide field. The earliest French congregations in England were those of Canterbury, gathered about 1548, and of London, in 1550. Three years later the English Prayer-Book was translated into French and printed for their use. From this time their numbers increased until, shortly after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, there were "thirty or more" foreign churches in London alone. Many of these, however, were very short-lived, and now one or two London churches, the French church still worshipping in the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral, and the French Hospital in London, are almost the sole remaining representatives of the Huguenot "strangers." In a valuable chapter on the "Refugee Documents and Archives," Mr. Kershaw indicates briefly the principal collections of historical material relating to his subject, the chief of which are the registers of the London churches preserved in Somerset House and the private collections of Lord Salisbury and the Marquis of Bath. The closing chapter is upon the present state of French Protestantism, and contains references to the important historical works on the Huguenots recently published in Europe and America. Though Mr. Kershaw has shown little literary skill in the arrangement of his materials, his book will prove a valuable guide to the student of this subject. He is in error, however, when he says of Meric Casaubon "that, while hiding in a cavern from his persecutors, he learned from his father his first Greek lessons." This was true of the latter, the far more famous Isaac Casaubon, who, when a lad of thirteen, was obliged by the massacre of St. Bartholomew to take refuge in the hills of Dauphiny with his father, a Huguenot pastor. Nor did James I. make Isaac a "Prebend of Westminster," but of Canterbury. Mr. Pattison says: "A stall at Westminster was named. This promise was not fulfilled."

Grammaire Latine. A l'usage des classes supérieures et des candidats à la licence ès lettres et aux agrégations. Par Salomon Reinach. Paris: Delagrave. 1886.

M. REINACH'S 'Grammaire Latine,' like the 'Manuel de Philologie Classique' with which the stripling scholar astonished the world a few years since, is a bold attempt to meet at once the needs of the beginner and the demands of the advanced student. Aware of the serious disadvantage of shifting text-books, he has comprised in one volume the elementary outline and the abstruse problem, and the same guide teaches us to inflect *rosa* and to observe the concord of adjective and substantive that brings us face to face with the grave questions of agglutination and of sentence accent.

For the beginner there is a condensed view of accidence and syntax, in which the lead of Lhomond has been followed rather than that of Burnouf. Which of the two is in itself the better approach to Latin for Frenchmen, Frenchmen must decide; and it seems they have decided for Lhomond. Of this part of the grammar, then, there is little to be said, except that M. Reinach has departed from the French rule of appending translations to the illustrative examples, and has appealed to German authority for this innovation. German authority is not wholly on his side, and the departure does not seem to be a wise one. The examples ought to be selected as far as possible with reference to charm of style as well as to value of contents, and the translations ought to be made with the greatest care, so as to give the student models for his own renderings; and if M. Reinach's practical experience as a teacher were at all proportioned to his marvellous powers of search and appropriation, he would have modified this feature of his book. Nor will he, we hope, take it amiss when we suggest that if the mnemonic verses of Zumpt are as valuable as he thinks, it would have been better to translate them into French, and not to leave them in their native German to serve as an exercise in both languages. At least, no American grammarian would have dared to make the transfer so easy to himself. But while even the elementary portions of the book are enriched by notes that give evidence of the use of the best authorities, the chief value of the grammar for this side of the water will be found to lie in those sections that are intended for the advanced scholar. Here the student will find a bibliography that has absorbed Hübner's admirable work and complemented it by ransacking catalogues and transactions and journals. The book teems with the latest results, is alive with the latest speculations, and the special student of Latin grammar will find himself stimulated to research in every direction. To those who are in quest of subjects for theses, for dissertations, M. Reinach's grammar will be a godsend.

One interesting feature in this book is the emphatic assertion of the rights of French scholars, who have been doing excellent work in classical philology of late years, and, as American scholars are mostly, either at first-hand or at second-hand, of German training, and hence, being more German than the Germans themselves, are apt to look askance at French work, it is well that they should be made aware of what they may be losing. One of the foremost representatives of classical philology in France said a few years since to the writer of this notice, "We are officers without an army"; but they are officers worthy to lead the armies of any land. Large portions of M. Reinach's book are taken, always, of course, with due acknowledgment, from German authorities; but his debt to Thurot's lectures, to Weil's classical treatise on the order of words, to Bréal's linguistic researches, to Riemann, and to Havet is made especially conspicuous.

A work that bristles with so many details as a Latin grammar, and such a Latin grammar as M. Reinach's, can only be criticised duly in an educational or philological journal, and even there the ragged regiment of sins that can be paraded by any fairly equipped censor is apt to become wearisome. Here we must be content to give thanks for the unwearied industry, the keen scent, the quick vision to which we owe the collection of so much valuable material, so many luminous facts, so many pregnant hints. Of course M. Reinach will expect to irritate as many veterans as he will stimulate candidates. He despatches many favorite theories with a magisterial wave of the hand, and those whose hearts are set on a reform of spelling will be annoyed at his long-tailed j's and his *poco-curante* attitude toward this vital subject. To be sure, there are eminent sinners, such as Cobet, who still dares to write 'adolescens' and 'negligo' and 'quum,' but the too seductive Cobet, like Plato's heterodox poet, must be sent out of the country with every demonstration of affection and respect. It is dangerous to be lax about anything, and we have in mind a distinguished scholar who began his downward career by abolishing Greek accents as meaningless symbols, then became criminally indifferent as to his breathings, and was finally lost in a slough of bad etymology.

M. Reinach would have been untrue to the nation whose philology he represents if he had not enlivened his subject with epigrammatic *mots* of his own as well as of others; and in the closing chapter, "On the Decadence of the Latin Language," the only section in which he has an opportunity for a long sweep, he develops a rare charm of style. Still, as a necessary offset to all the good that has been said and intimated above, it must be added, in all candor, that M. Reinach's work, valuable as it is, does not produce on a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grammarian the effect of the work of a grammarian so much as that of a philologian who accepts grammar as a necessary part of his profession; and one misses the fresh breath that comes from his archæological writings. In spite of sharp self-assertion here and there, he is dominated by his material rather than dominates it, and his work lacks occasionally consistency of view and firmness of touch. It would, for example, be impossible for a grammarian in grain to tell us, on page 183, that in the notorious passage (Cic. ad Att. II. 1, 12), *Paetus omnes libros, quos pater suus reliquisset, mihi donavit*, the change to *reliquerat* would have required a change of *suus* to *ejus*, and yet, on page 215, to retain *suus* with the indicative form.

The English Catholic Nonjurors of 1715: being a Summary of the Register of their Estates, with Genealogical and other Notes, and an Appendix of unpublished documents in the Public Record Office. Edited by the late Very Rev. Edgar E. Estcourt and John Orlebar Payne. London: Burns & Oates; New York: Catholic Publication Society.

THESE lists were prepared in accordance with an Act (1 Geo. 1 cap. 55) obliging Papists to register their names and real estates—a measure intended, no doubt, as a menace to the friends of the Pretender. That it was complied with by so many is evidence of a much greater number who evaded the law, and, as a measure of precaution, it cannot be deemed harsh for that period. It is indeed difficult to understand the object of the present publication, as the genealogical information obtainable is scanty and of no especial value. But there seems to be a fashion in England to glorify the Catholic families of the last century, for no particular reason, just as the current here is running in favor of the Huguenots, as we pointed out in our review of Dr. Baird's history.

A Study of Dante. By Susan E. Blow. With an introduction by William T. Harris, LL.D. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1886. 8vo, xi and 102 pp.

THERE grows in the campagna of Rome a plant of the Jack-in-the-pulpit family which attains such perfection of development that its odor, to an unaccustomed nostril, becomes extraordinarily offensive, and a new-comer can only obtain specimens of the flower by sudden rushes at it, followed by immediate retreat from the infected neighborhood—always in danger of being overcome by the sick drowsiness it causes. Do not let us speak of an estimable author or authoress as a Jack-in-the-pulpit; do not let us refer to the sick drowsiness caused by the perfection of their development; let us only exhibit specimens of the flower obtained by sudden rushes at it, followed by immediate retreat. We gather from Dr. Harris the belief that Dante—like the other three "world poets," Homer, Shakspere, and Goethe—"used his vehicles of expression to reveal to all individual men their substantial manhood as embodied in the institutions of civilization." We believe we quote correctly, but the fatal drowsiness is upon us; and could that sentence read that "he never used his expressive vehicles to convey to men collectively the institutions of civilization as embodied in their substantial manhood"? Another rush, before we succumb—this time to the authoress. "It is evident"—to her, but, alas! at this moment nothing seems evident to us, except our own haste to get away—"it is evident that we may grasp the universe as an including totality, and yet apprehend very faintly its nature and end." In the present wild whirling of our brains, this sentence, the whole book, is to us as the universe. We grasp it as an including totality, we apprehend very faintly its nature and end.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimoriensis Tertii, 1884. Baltimore: John Murphy & Sons.
Alma-Tadema, Laurence. Love's Martyr. D. Appleton & Co. 50 cents.
Angell on Highways. 3d ed. With Notes by G. F. Choate. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
Archer, T. By Fire and Sword: A Story of the Huguenots. Cassell & Co. $1.
Arthur, J. C., Barnes, C. R., and Coulter, J. M. Handbook of Plant Dissection. Henry Holt & Co. $1.50.
Bainbridge-Hoff, Commander W. The Avoidance of Collisions at Sea. D. Van Nostrand.
Baluffe, Auguste. Molière inconnu: Sa vie. Boston: Schoenhof.
Barr, Amelia E. A Daughter of Fife. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.
Bassett, J. Persia: The Land of the Imams. Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.50.
Bayly, Captain G. Sea-Life Sixty Years Ago. Harper & Brothers. 25 cents.
Blair, L. H. Unwise Laws: A Consideration of the Operations of a Protective Tariff upon Industry, Commerce, and Society. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.
Blind, Mathilde. Madame Roland. (Famous Women Series.) Boston: Roberts Brothers. $1.
Brooks, H. M. The Olden Times Series. Vol. II. The Days of the Spinning Wheel in New England. Boston: Ticknor & Co. 50 cents.
Church, Rev. A. J. With the King at Oxford: A Tale of the Great Rebellion. Harper & Brothers. 25 cents.
Clandy, F. Goethe's Faust. First Part. Translated in the Original Metres. Washington: W. H. Morrison.
Claretie, Jules. La Vie à Paris. 1885. F. W. Christern.
Cooke, G. W. Poets and Problems. Boston: Ticknor & Co.
Curry, Lily. A Bohemian Tragedy. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Bros. $1.
Davis, Rebecca H. Natasqua. Cassell & Co. 25 cents.
Dunn, J. P. jr. Massacres of the Mountains: A History of the Indian Wars of the Far West. Harper & Brothers.
Durrie, D. S. An Alphabetical Index to American Genealogies and Pedigrees. 3d ed. Albany: Joel Munsell's Sons.
Falloux, Comte de. Études et Souvenirs. Boston: Schoenhof.
Fauriel, M. The Last Days of the Consulate. Edited by M. L. Lalanne. A. C. Armstrong & Son. $1.50; also Harper & Brothers. 20 cents.
Flaubert, G. Salammbô. Englished by M. F. Sheldon. Saxon & Co. $1.50.
Furness, H. H. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. Vol. VI. Othello. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. $4.
Giffen, R. Essays in Finance. Second Series. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $3.50.
Goethe's Faust. Translated by John Anster, LL.D., with an introduction by Rev. H. R. Haweis. George Routledge & Sons. 10 cents.
Gomme, G. L. *The Gentleman's Magazine* Library. Archæology. Part I. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $2.50.
Griffiths, A. Fast and Loose: A Novel. New ed. Rand, McNally & Co. 35 cents.
Halsted, G. B. The Elements of Geometry. John Wiley & Sons.
Hapgood, Isabel F. The Epic Songs of Russia. Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.
Hittell, T. H. History of California. Vol. II. San Francisco: Pacific Press Publishing House.
Hudson, J. F. The Railways and the Republic. Harper & Brothers.
Hunt, Louise L. Memoir of Mrs. Edward Livingston. Harper & Brothers.
In Memory of Winfield Scott Hancock. Letters and Addresses Contributed at a General Meeting of the Military Service Institution, held at Governor's Island February 25, 1886. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 50 cents.
Jackson, Helen H. Hetty's Strange History. New ed. Boston: Roberts Bros.
Jackson, Helen H. Mercy Philbrick's Choice. New ed. Boston: Roberts Bros.
Janes, L. J. A Study of Primitive Christianity. Boston: Index Association. $1.50.
Jaques, W. H. Torpedoes for National Defense. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 25 cents.
Johnson, Virginia W. Tulip Place: A Story of New York. Harper & Bros. 25 cents.
Kelley, J. D. J. A Desperate Chance. Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.
Kurtz, C. M. National Academy Notes and Complete Catalogue. 1886. Cassell & Co. 50 cents.
Lee, F. G. King Edward the Sixth, Supreme Head: An Historical Sketch. Catholic Publication Society.
Leighton, R. F. First Steps in Latin. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.22.
Littell's Living Age. Vol. LIII. January–March, 1886. Boston: Littell & Co.
Ludlow, J. M. The Captain of the Janizaries. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.50.
Matheson, G. Moments on the Mount: A Series of Devotional Meditations. 2d ed. A. C. Armstrong & Son. $1.25.
Matthews, B., and Hutton L. Actors and Actresses of Great Britain and the United States. Vol. I. Garrick and his Contemporaries. Cassell & Co. $1.50.
Mayo, Isabella F. The Mystery of Allan Grale: A Novel. Harper & Bros. 20 cents.
McCarty, L. P. Annual Statistician. 1886. F. E. Grant.
Meredith, George. Evan Harrington: A Novel. New ed. Boston: Roberts Bros. $2.
Morley, J. On Compromise. Macmillan & Co. $1.50.
Murray, J. D. C. Aunt Rachel: A Rustic Sentimental Comedy. Macmillan & Co. $1.
Noel, M. Buz: or, The Life and Adventures of a Honey Bee. Henry Holt & Co. $1.
O'Connor, T. P. The Parnell Movement: with a Sketch of Irish Parties from 1843. Benziger Bros.
Ohnet, Georges. Les Dames de Croix-Mort. F. W. Christern.
Porter, Noah. Kant's Ethics: A Critical Exposition. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. $1.25.
Rae, G. The Country Banker: His Clients, Cares, and Work. Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.50.
Report of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Bar Association. Philadelphia: Dando Printing Co.
Ribot, Th. German Psychology of To-Day. The Empirical School. Translated by J. M. Baldwin, with Preface by James McCosh. Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.
Robinson, A. Mary F. An Italian Garden: A Book of Songs. Boston: Roberts Bros.
Sala, G. A. The Strange Adventures of Capt. Dangerous. Harper & Bros. 20 cents.
Schilling, N. H. The Present Condition of Electric Lighting. Report made at Munich, September 26, 1885. Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co. 50 cents.
Schuyler, Eugene. American Diplomacy and the Furtherance of Commerce. Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.
Smith, Mrs. J. G. Atla: A Story of the Lost Island. Harper & Brothers.
Smyth, J. P. How We Got Our Bible: An Answer to Questions Suggested by the New Revision. John Wiley & Sons. 60 cents.
Stoddard, W. O. Two Arrows: A Story of Red and White. Harper & Brothers.
Szold, B. The Book of Job, with a New Commentary. Baltimore: H. F. Siemers.
Todd, C. B. Life and Letters of Joel Barlow, LL.D., Poet, Statesman, Philosopher. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2.50.
Trail, Florence. My Journal in Foreign Lands. 2d ed. G. P. Putnam's Sons.
Van Dyke, J. S. Theism and Evolution, with an Introduction by Rev. A. A. Hodge. A. C. Armstrong & Son. $1.50.

The SECOND EDITION of 'OBLIVION,' Miss M'Clelland's Romance of the Mountains of North Carolina, is now ready. 16mo, Leisure Hour Series, $1.

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

F. W. CHRISTERN,
37 West Twenty-third Street, New York,
Importer of Foreign Books, Agent for the leading Paris Publishers, Tauchnitz's British Authors, Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. Catalogue of stock mailed on demand. A large assortment always on hand, and new books received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

French, German, Spanish, Italian.

You can, by ten weeks' study, master either of these languages sufficiently for every-day and business conversation, by DR. RICH. S. ROSENTHAL'S celebrated MEISTERSCHAFT SYSTEM. Terms, $5.00 for books of each language, with privilege of answers to all questions, and correction of exercises. Sample copy, Part I., 25 cents. Liberal terms to Teachers.

MEISTERSCHAFT PUBLISHING CO.,
Herald Building, Boston, Mass.

SCHOOL BOOKS IN FOREIGN LANguages. Miscellaneous Books in Foreign Languages. Catalogues on application. Foreign Periodicals.
CARL SCHOENHOF, Importer, 144 Tremont St., Boston.

FRENCH BOOKS.
Latest French novels and best works relating to general literature, theatre, fine arts, etc.
Editions de luxe, illustrées de Conquet, Launette, Jouaust, Quantin, etc. Also rare and curious second-hand books, handsomely bound by Trautz-Bauzannet, Cuzin, Chambolle, Thibaron.
New catalogue nearly ready will be mailed free upon application.
Autographs; sole agent for Et. Charavay, archiviste-paleographe of Paris. A choice selection is always kept in hand. JOHN DELAY, 23 Union Square, N. Y.

BOOK-BINDING
well done and with good materials, for *Harper's*, *Century*, and magazines of the same size. Hand some binding and fine work a specialty.
60c.
CHARLES MACDONALD & CO.,
Periodical Agency. 55 Washington St., Chicago.

Subscriptions Taken for ALL Newspapers and Magazines.

"EMBRACE THE GOLDEN OPPORtunity." Volumes and numbers of the *Nation* to complete sets. Bought, sold, and exchanged.
A. S. CLARK, 34 Park Row.

Unmounted Photographs
OF ANCIENT AND MODERN WORKS OF ART,
Embracing reproductions of famous original paintings, sculpture, architecture, etc. Price, cabinet size, $1.50 per dozen. Send 10-cent stamp for catalogue and supplement of over 7,000 subjects.
SOULE PHOTOGRAPH CO.,
Publishers, 338 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
Please mention the *Nation*.

Fisher's Outlines
OF
Universal History.
By Prof. Geo. Park Fisher, D.D., LL.D.
"Decidedly the best book of the kind extant in English."—*N. Y. Tribune.*
2 Vols., 8vo, uncut, gilt top, $5.00.
1 Vol., extra cloth, leather back, $3.00.
IVISON, BLAKEMAN, TAYLOR & CO.,
753 and 755 Broadway, New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED